

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

JULY, 1878.

ART. I.—THE CENTENARY OF VOLTAIRE.

1. *Premières Lettres à MM. les Membres du Conseil Municipal de Paris sur le Centenaire de Voltaire.* Par M. L'ÉVÊQUE D'ORLÉANS. Paris, Librairie de la Société Bibliographique. 1878.
2. *Nouvelles Lettres sur le Centenaire de Voltaire.* Par M. L'ÉVÊQUE D'ORLÉANS. Paris. 1878.
3. *Dernières Lettres sur le Centenaire de Voltaire.* Par M. L'ÉVÊQUE D'ORLÉANS. Paris. 1878.
4. *Le Rappel.* Paris, 13 Prairial, An 86 (June 1, 1878).

THE Catholic world owes a new debt of gratitude to Mgr. Dupanloup for his action upon the occasion of the centenary of Voltaire. He has saved France from the disgrace of honouring by a national *fête* the great apostle of infidelity, and in his ten letters to the Municipal Council of Paris he has produced a work which, short as it is, will do much to destroy the false reputation of the "Patriarch of Ferney." These letters have more than a passing interest or a temporary value. They form a permanent armoury of weapons against Voltairianism. Voltaire himself is made to reveal his own character in his own words; the great names of the Revolution and of the Liberal school, Rousseau, Mirabeau, Marat, Brissot, Benjamin Constant, Béranger, Renan, Taine, Henri Martin, Laboulaye, Louis Blanc, are called as corroborative witnesses; the verse of Victor Hugo himself, written under a happier inspiration than his speech of May 30th, is added to the mass of evidence, and the reader is left to judge of the worth of the man whom the Revolution at Paris and at Rome delights to honour.

It cannot be said that the centenary celebration was a great success. The Government wisely refused to give it a national character, and would not even sanction the erection of a statue in one of the squares, which was originally intended to have been the chief feature of the demonstration. The committee appointed to organize it was unable even to hold together; it split into two hostile sections, and the 30th of May witnessed two rival celebra-

tions. One took place in a circus, where a certain Dr. Hulie told his audience that Voltaire's great claim to the gratitude of posterity was that he had sapped the foundation of all religion, that his one weakness was that he believed in God, but that the general unenlightenment of his age was an excuse for this; doubtless had he lived now he would have been an atheist and a materialist. But the more important demonstration of the two was that held at the *Gaîté*. This was the work of the more moderate section of the worshippers of Voltaire, and here the great attraction was a speech by Victor Hugo. The poet was supported by the leaders of the advanced radical party in France; around him were grouped infidel writers like Littré and Ernest Renan; politicians of the stamp of Challemlacour, who, when the German sword was beating down France, thought less of fighting the Prussians than of denouncing "clerical intrigues";* journalists like About and M. Girardin, who after being the paid *claqueurs* of the Empire, are now worshipping the rising sun of the Republic. The Red wing of the Left in the Chamber was well represented. The names of Barodet, Martier de Montjan, Lockroy, Greppo, Naquet and Jules Ferry (of *communard* fame) are sufficient to show what was the character of the audience.

It is well to read Victor Hugo's speech and Mgr. Dupanloup's letters side by side. The contrast between them is a striking one. Victor Hugo deals chiefly in vague generalities, loose statements, wordy phrases, which, when we read them over again, seem very like "sound and fury, signifying nothing." The speech is often eloquent, but it can hardly have been satisfactory, even to many of those who heard it, for, if they knew even a little of the writings of their hero, they must have felt that it was untrue. It was certainly in one passage almost as blasphemous as anything that Voltaire ever wrote,—and, perhaps, this will have opened the eyes of some of the orthodox English admirers of Victor Hugo. On the other hand, Mgr. Dupanloup's letters are calm, judicial, convincing. Voltaire's own words are made to tell his story. Everything is definite, accurate, well-substantiated by references which any one can verify for himself. At the same time there is no attack upon living men. The Bishop of Orleans having set before himself the task of showing to his fellow-countrymen what was the idol which the centenary committee desired them to honour, strictly keeps to his task, and says not one word too few or too many. Victor Hugo's eloquence will add nothing to the fame of Voltaire: Mgr. Dupanloup's concise testimony will do much to diminish it.

Born on the 21st of November, 1694, and dying on May 30th,

* See the official report on the acts of the Government of the National Defence for the department of the Rhone.

1778, Voltaire lived from the age of Louis XIV. to that of Louis XVI. His life began in the days that saw the Grand Monarque receiving the surrender of Flemish fortresses, to which Vauban had opened the way, while Noailles, Catinat, and Luxembourg were adding the names of Stafarda, Marsiglia, Steinkirk, and Neerwinden, to the roll of French victories. It ended in the days when a tide of growing discontent was already rising around the old monarchy, and in a few years more Paris was to see royal heads roll upon the scaffold. He had lived through the long decline of the French monarchy, while the seed sown by the despotism of the Renaissance was ripening into disaffection and sedition, and that sown by Gallican, insubordinate, Jansenist rigorism had already produced its terrible fruit of irreligion, scepticism, and immoral license. He had been the child of his epoch, rather than its leader. If it honoured him, it was not because he had taught it anything, but because he had known how to pander to its doubts and its passions, and put it in the best of humour with itself by calling disbelief philosophy, and helping it to laugh at all that might have held it back from the headlong pursuit of pleasure and self-satisfaction. He had himself plunged deep in the license of the Regency and of the ill-starred reign which followed it, when a Pompadour or a Dubarry had more power in France than a minister or a prince. He had suffered from the caprice of arbitrary power, and knew what the interior of the Bastille was like; he had been in exile, but, nevertheless, he was clever enough always to find some means of keeping a full purse and a grimly-smiling face—books and pamphlets brought him something, court pensions something more, army contracts were a fruitful source of wealth, occasional ventures in the slave-trade not unprofitable. Money gave him power. A restless industry kept him always writing; tales, dramas, poems, letters, pamphlets, pasquinades, streamed from his pen. Always aggressive and a master of ridicule, he attacked everything—his country, the people, the clergy, the Church, the divinity of Jesus Christ. A wide, superficial knowledge enabled him to make an easy display of what looked like learning; but of that knowledge, which looks below the surface and grasps the real meaning of things, he had none.* When he had an end to gain, he was the basest flatterer of kings. He crouched to Frederick of Prussia, and the infamous murderess, the Czarina Catherine. He went lower still in his flattery. At sixty, he wrote of La Pompadour, as *le plus beau*

* "Voltaire," says M. Ernest Renan, "understood neither the Bible, nor Homer, nor Greek art, nor the religions of the Ancient World, nor Christianity, nor the Middle Ages. . . . In the eighteenth century, men did not look for serious, enlightened, and thoughtful study; and instead of it, they had the buffoonery, the railing, and superficial scepticism of Voltaire."—*Revue des Deux Mondes*, May 1st, 1864, and November 1st, 1865.

nom de la France, and hoped soon to see her queen; * at eighty, he was tuning his lyre to the praise of the "adorable Egeria," Madame Dubarry, and writing to her to tell her how he kissed her portrait.† He spoke of the people as stupid fools, whom it was not worth while to teach; he rejoiced at the downfall of Poland, the trampling out of a free state by an alliance of despots. It is true that he protested, and protested effectually, against more than one tyrannical act that disgraced the jurisprudence of France; it is true that he gave some of his ill-earned wealth to the poor. He was a man, and not a demon. But it is none the less true that he prosecuted, imprisoned, and ruined on false testimony this or that poor bookseller who dared to print his name on the title-page of a book which Voltaire wished to attribute to another man; invoking punishment upon the unfortunate wretch, not for violating his right of authorship, but for circulating the very blasphemies and obscenities which he himself had penned, and wished to circulate, if only the odium of them were borne by some other man. He himself practised the doctrine he taught to Thiriot, when he told him that to lie for a good end was a virtue, and that one should not lie timidly or for a time, but boldly and always, "lying like a devil."‡ For those who offended him, he had only fierce hatred and abuse, for all that was good or holy a bitter sneer. The very foulness of his private life screens it alike from examination and criticism. His years of open, avowed adultery at Cirey, the wretched scene at Madame du Chatelet's deathbed, the miserable filthiness of the poem of "La Pucelle," his letter written, even as an old man, to a niece of his, asking for obscene pictures, "*ce qu'on trouvera de plus immodeste*," § to decorate the walls of Ferney—these are not things upon which a Christian pen can dilate, nor would we have even alluded to them were it not that there are times when the duty of truth outweighs that of silence. This, then, was the would-be destroyer of the Church, the Church that produced a Gregory VII. and a Francis of Assisi, a Louis le Saint and a Jeanne d'Arc, an Ignatius and a Xavier, and in this very age of Voltaire, a Liguori, and a Paul of the Cross. These are but a few names of those we honour; and they who call us fools, because we

* Letter of August, 1754, quoted by Mgr. Dupanloup, *Nouvelles Lettres*, p. 10.

† "M. de Laborde, m'a montré votre portrait. Ne vous fâchez pas, Madame, si j'ai pris la liberté de lui rendre les deux baisers."

‡ "Le mensonge n'est un vice que quand il fait du mal. C'est une très-grande vertu quand il fait du bien. . . . Soyez donc plus vertueux que jamais : il faut mentir comme un diable, non pas timidement, non pas pour un temps, mais hardiment et toujours."—Letters to Thiriot, October, 1736, quoted by Mgr. Dupanloup, *Dernières Lettres*, p. 17.

§ Letter to M^{de}. de Fontaine, June, 1757, *Nouvelles Lettres*, p. 41.

honour them, crown with laurels the bust of Voltaire. We can only hope, though we can hardly believe, that they do not know him; for, to despise Voltaire, there is no need of being a Christian, it is enough to be a man.

That Victor Hugo should have panegyricized Voltaire is not surprising; we are not quite sure that he is responsible for what he says when he addresses an audience, and of itself his speech would have been of no importance. What gives it importance is that so many French papers have been found to receive it with enthusiasm, and more than one English journal to praise it, or, what is nearly as bad, to apologize for it. M. Hugo told his audience that they were assembled to do honour to civilization and progress, to industry, science, and peace. "Peace," he exclaimed, "is the virtue of civilization, war is a crime against it." Yet he was speaking in praise of the man who rejoiced at the invasion of Poland, flattered the soldier Frederic of Prussia, and wrote to Catherine II. that "she gave him new life by slaughtering the Turks." * "We are here," continued Victor Hugo, "at this great and solemn moment to bow religiously before the moral law,"—this in honour of the man who had trampled it underfoot all his life long,—"and to say to the world which is listening to France, There is only one power, conscience, in the service of justice; and there is only one glory, genius, in the service of truth." M. Victor Hugo is a bold man. This was a daring exordium to the panegyric of a man whose conscience never stood in the way of either his pleasure or his advantage, and who told his friends to lie like devils, and lied "*comme un diable*" himself.

M. Hugo then told the terrible story of Calas and Labarre. In a few powerful sentences he conjured up a fearful picture of their deaths under a condemnation which in both cases was cruel, and in one, if not in both, absolutely unjust; and then he went on to speak of Voltaire's protest against these proceedings. Victor Hugo's error consisted in taking these dark deeds as normal types of a state of things which he alleged Voltaire had destroyed; there was a further error in supposing that Voltaire acted in the matter from pure philanthropy. There cannot be a doubt that he grasped eagerly at the affair of Calas, and the affair of Labarre, as means of strengthening his attack upon the clergy and the Government. The jurisprudence under which these miserable and cruel scenes occurred was in pressing need of reform, and had Voltaire come forward as an earnest promoter of reform we should applaud his action as much as M. Victor Hugo did. But his was not the stuff of which reformers are made; there was little real earnestness about

* "Votre Majesté Impériale me rend la vie en tuant les Turcs."—Letter of May 29, 1772.

him. Between a John Howard, reforming first the prisons of his own country and then travelling over Europe on the same mission, dying at last in Southern Russia wearied out with his labours, and an Arouet de Voltaire, writing clever pamphlets on a fearful mis-carriage of justice, there is a distance that cannot be measured,—the two men belong to different orders of existence. We shall not make any comment upon Victor Hugo's blasphemous comparison between his hero and the Saviour of the world. It formed the main feature of his speech. No words of ours are strong enough to protest against it, or to convey our horror at the language in which it was expressed.

Continuing his speech, Victor Hugo proceeded to remark that great men seldom stand alone, and with the name of Voltaire he coupled those of his contemporaries Diderot and Rousseau; he spoke of Diderot as the founder of the *Encyclopédie*; of Rousseau he spoke enthusiastically, vaguely, absurdly,* but it was strangest of all that he should couple the names of Rousseau and Voltaire. If ever two men most cordially hated each other, these were they. The original idea of the centenary committee was that as Voltaire and Rousseau had died in the same year, their death should be commemorated in a single common celebration. Mgr. Dupanloup's second letter put an end to that idea. He quotes in it from Voltaire his opinion of Rousseau, and *vice versâ*. "You talk to me of this Voltaire," wrote Rousseau to M. de Moulton, "why do you let the name of that buffoon disfigure your letters? . . . I would hate him more if I despised him less. . . . I only see in his great talents a great disgrace, on account of the unworthy use he makes of them. . . . His talents as well as his riches only serve to feed the depravity of his heart." In another letter which reads like a prophecy he wrote:—

"Satire, lying, and calumny have become the weapons of M. de Voltaire. . . . This blustering apostle of impiety, this brilliant genius with a degraded soul, this man so great by his talents, so vile by the use he makes of them, will leave us long and cruel memories of his stay amongst us. The ruin of morality, the loss of liberty which necessarily follows it, will be for our descendants the monument of his glory and of our gratitude. If there remains in their hearts any love for their native land, they will detest his memory, and he will be more cursed than admired."†

* Even to one who knows nothing of Rousseau's life what can be more absurd than Victor Hugo's words:—"Rousseau a rendu à la femme un admirable service, il a complété la mère par la nourrice, il a mis l'une auprès de l'autre ces deux majestés du berceau"! as if "ces deux majestés du berceau" were unknown until Jean Jacques Rousseau preached the gospel of the "*Nouvelle Héloïse*" and the "*Confessions*" to the 18th century.

† Letter to Vernet, November 29, 1760.

Unfortunately for France he still finds admirers, though all the ills Rousseau predicted have been felt as terrible realities. He, at least, had no desire to be honoured side by side with Voltaire. "As for your wish to place Voltaire and me on the same throne," he said to Brosette, "I declare to you that I would find it rather difficult to descend so low."

As for Voltaire, he fully repaid Jean Jacques for his hatred; but while there is a certain dignity about Rousseau's reproaches to his enemy, the "Patriarch of Ferney" uses only the language of petty spite. He writes of Rousseau as "a brainless idiot,"* a creature with "only vitriol and arsenic in his veins."† Elsewhere he calls him "a baboon, a little monkey, that might well be tied up and shown at a fair for a halfpenny."

"This infamous Jean Jacques," he wrote to D'Alembert,‡ "is the Judas of the philosophic brotherhood. To praise this scoundrel would be to burn a candle before the devil." He did what he could to expose Rousseau's vices, and the unfortunate man complained that it was to Voltaire he owed half his sufferings. Meanwhile Voltaire affected to regard him as a monster of ingratitude. "A monkey," he wrote, "that bites those who feed him is more reasonable and happier than this man. . . . He is the most wicked scamp that ever disgraced literature." A fool, a prince of fools, a scoundrel, a Judas, a calumniator, "a soul full of mud and gall," "the lineal descendant of the dog of Diogenes," "a man without either heart or brains,"—these were the terms he applied to Rousseau again and again. See how these *philosophers* hated each other!

From these three men, said Victor Hugo, sprang the French Revolution; it was an "emanation" of their minds; "behind Diderot one sees Danton, behind Rousseau Robespierre, and behind Voltaire Mirabeau." He spoke truly, and with equal truth he spoke of Rabelais with his Gargantua, and Molière with his Tartuffe as the precursors of Voltaire. But his glorification of modern progress was as false as anything in his whole speech. He told his audience that "whoever now says '*La force prime le droit*' does an act belonging to the middle ages." But this maxim of "*La force prime le droit*," is now the guiding rule of European politics, and is the very essence of the method of government by the absolute will of the majority, irrespective of any higher law, which is the cardinal principle of the Revolution—the emanation of the soul of Voltaire. Proceeding with his panegyric, he made an eloquent protest against the "sanguinary glory of war"—he denounced the tax of blood—forgetting that Europe owes to the Revolution that

* To D'Alembert, July 16, 1764. † To Damilaville, Dec. 31, 1764.

‡ Aug. 28, 1765.

very tax of blood, the conscription. Then he won a ready burst of applause by alluding to the exhibition at the Trocadéro, and the Champ de Mars as the true field of battle for nations. But, he said, war still existed, princes persisted in their quarrels. In the name of Voltaire and his fellow-philosophers, he called on civilization to protest; let the shades of Voltaire, Jean Jacques, Diderot, and Montesquieu be invoked—"since night comes from thrones, let light come from their tombs!"

He sat down amid a storm of applause. One awful thought strikes us as we read his words. The immortal soul of Voltaire is still living. We wonder what he thought of Hugo's panegyric of his life.

Theoretically, when a stone is cast into any one of the thousand bays and creeks of the ocean, it produces a system of waves and vibrations whose ultimate effect might be traced in imagination through every sea around the globe. In the same way it has been said, and doubtless with more of practical truth, that the life of every man exerts an influence through all time. But in both the case of the storm and of the man, the effect seems practically to disappear within a very limited space. But there are lives whose effects we can trace for centuries down the stream of time, as we can trace the tide-wave round the world, and foremost amongst such lives are those of men who rightly or wrongly have won themselves fame in literature. Of them it is palpably evident to all that their deeds live after them. Their life, as it were, is prolonged in their books. For hundreds of years they still speak to men. Their influence is increasing. Hence the terrible responsibility of those who can use with real might the pen—"that weapon light as the air, strong as the thunderbolt."* Voltaire still speaks to the world through his works. They are read by thousands. The *prestige* of his name leads men to take them up, his brilliant, fascinating style makes them eager readers. What does he teach them?—doubt and disbelief in the region of faith, corruption in the region of morals. Voltaire's own words testify that this is the character of his works, their natural tendency.

"Our forefathers," he said, speaking of Christianity, "have shaken off a portion of this fearful yoke; but everything tells us it is now time to have done with it, and to destroy the idol from top to bottom." He adopted a phrase which has become historical. He uses it again and again in his letters—"Ecrasez l'infame!" "Crush out the infamous thing!" It recurs continually under various forms.

"Get all the brethren," he says, "to assail the *infame* with voice and pen, without giving it a moment's peace."

* Victor Hugo.

"I am seventy years old, I hope to live a few years more to assist in crushing the *infame*."

"Shall I die without seeing the last blow struck at this abominable hydra, which poisons and kills? Let us crush the *infame*."

And so it goes on through letter after letter. But, perhaps, we shall be told that what Voltaire attacked was "bigotry," or "superstition," or "clerical tyranny," and not religion. But this theory, with which more than one contemporary journalist has endeavoured to prevent the "centenary" from startling his readers, falls to the ground before the *catena* of quotations from the works of Voltaire contained in Mgr. Dupanloup's last letter. He attacked Christianity, its very root; from the age of twenty-eight to his dying day he blasphemed against Jesus Christ, assailed His divinity, His character, the Gospels which contain His words and the record of His life. In one of his earliest poems he exclaims,—

Le fils d'un charpentier enfanté par Marie
Expira sur la croix.
Je ne reconnais point à cette indigne image
Le Dieu que je dois adorer;
Je croirais le déshonorer
Par une telle insulte et par un tel hommage.*

Again, he says in language which we prefer to quote without translating it:—

Nos déichristicoles, à qui attribuent-ils la divinité? A un homme de néant, vil et méprisable, qui n'avait, ni talent, ni science, ni adresse, né de pauvres parents, et qui, depuis qu'il a voulu paraître dans le monde et faire parler de lui, n'a passé que pour un insensé et pour un séducteur, qui a été méprisé, fouetté, et enfin qui a été pendu, comme la plupart de ceux qui ont voulu jouer le même rôle, quand ils ont été sans courage et sans habileté.†

This is not the worst passage that could be quoted. Some men like Strauss have attacked the historical existence of Jesus Christ; others, like Renan, have assailed His divinity, while at the same time speaking of Him as the best of men. Voltaire took neither course. He not only denied the divinity of our Blessed Lord, but he heaped upon Him foul calumny that could only have sprung from a mind so debased that it was utterly incapable of reverence, and impure to the very core. If any one thinks this language too strong, let him turn to Mgr. Dupanloup's last letter.

Of the Gospels he said that it was hard to say which was the most ridiculous of the miracles they related—that there was "nothing so extravagant in Don Quixote"—that "the fables of *Æsop* were

* *Épître à Uranie*.

† *Œuvres*, tom. iv. p. 454; quoted by Mgr. Dupanloup, *Dernières Lettres*, p. 51.

more instructive than all these rude parables"—that "there were as many errors as there were words in the Gospel," that "Christians uttered lies, and proved them by lies," that "Christianity was a mass of absurdities," that "all that is told about Jesus is worthy of Bedlam," that the Acts of the Apostles form "the most foolish, fanatical, and disgusting of legends."* Have we not here what even the freethinker Renan has fitly called "l'exégèse de la pelissonerie"—"the exegesis of scoundrelism."

We need not pursue this point further. It is clear that the object of Voltaire's writings was to destroy all faith and reverence. But one observation we must add. All the worst passages in Voltaire's writings, his most outrageous insults to Christianity, his most horrible blasphemies against Jesus Christ were collected by the centenary committee in a cheap pamphlet, and scattered broadcast over France as a preparation for the *fête*. This should open the eyes even of Protestant Englishmen as to the character of the liberal propaganda in France.

We turn to our second point—the demoralizing character of Voltaire's writings: here of course we dare not quote in justification of our charge from the works themselves, but there is no need of this. We shall follow Mgr. Dupanloup in quoting Voltaire's own opinion of the tendency of his writings. In his latter days he wrote the infamous poem of *La Pucelle*, the poem which Béranger said he could never forgive him for having written.† Written secretly, and circulated in manuscript, it fell into the hands of the booksellers, who printed it, and it has ever since appeared among Voltaire's works. Whilst he was writing to his friends promising them full copies of it, it appeared in print. He at once boldly denied the authorship, and joined with those who denounced its horrible immorality. "It is most shameful (c'est le comble d'opprobre)," he wrote to D'Argental,‡ "to see my name affixed to such a work. It contains things to make good taste and humanity shudder." He wrote to the Syndics of the booksellers of Paris. "The fragments of this unworthy rhapsody which are circulating in Paris under my name have been sent to me; they are a dishonour to literature, and I most earnestly beg you to prevent the appearance of these works of darkness."§ A bookseller of

* For the reference to the works of Voltaire, see Mgr. Dupanloup's last letter.

† "Je le pris," said Béranger in one of his letters, "je le pris presque en haine, lorsque je lus le poème où il outrage Jeanne d'Arc, véritable divinité patriotique qui dès l'enfance fut l'objet de mon culte."

‡ May 20, 1755.

§ Almost the same day he wrote to the Duc de Richelieu, "La voulez-vous pour vous amuser, Monseigneur?—Quoi? Qui? La Pucelle, la Pucelle, la Pucelle! Je vous enverrai par la voie que vous m'ordonnerez; vous l'aurez, plus complète et plus finie que personne: et cela ne lassera pas que d'égayer votre belle imagination. C'est le vrai bréviaire de mon héros."

Geneva published the poem. Voltaire denounced him to the magistrates and had him imprisoned. He wrote to them :—" I was seized with horror at the sight of this book, which with as much insolence as stupidity insults all that is most sacred." Neither himself nor any one in his household, he said, would write anything so infamous. He felt sure, he added, that the magistrates would not allow the publication of such horrible calumnies. Six years after he was writing to D'Alembert with cynical irony to inform him that ' La Pucelle ' had received the last touches, and the poem was complete." " The subject of Jeanne," he said, " was dear to the nation, and the author inspired by God had brought a pure zeal to the execution of his task."*

Well might Victor Hugo, writing calmly at his desk, not haranguing from a platform, say of the author of " La Pucelle," " Imagine Voltaire thrown into this decaying society (of the 18th century), like a serpent in a marsh. All his venom was needed to make the filth boil ";† a strange comment upon his speech of May 30th ! Years ago, in one of his earlier poems, Victor Hugo said with equal truth of Voltaire :—

Oh tremble ! ce sophiste a sondé bien des fanges !
Oh tremble ! ce faux sage a perdu bien des anges !
Ce démon, noir malin, fond sur les cœurs pieux,
Et les brise, et souvent, sous ses griffes cruelles,
Plume à plume j'ai vu tomber ces blanches ailes
Qui font qu'un âme vole et s'enfuit dans les cieux.

All this is terribly true. The crowds who crowned the bust of Voltaire with laurels at the *Gaiété* did honour to the man who more than any one else laboured with a diabolical zeal to destroy faith, purity, reverence for a high ideal—all, in fact, that raises man above the brute. It is easy to talk of his protest against the judicial murder of Calas and Labarre, if one can only forget the praise he lavished on the partition of Poland, which was the deliberate murder of a whole nation. It is easy to speak of him as the friend of freedom, if one can only forget that the sufferings of negro slaves were coined into money to fill his purse ; that even when he was the wealthy proprietor of Ferney he was speculating in slaves, and, like a new Tartuffe, affecting to rejoice that the poor creatures were thus delivered from death in their own land, and that he was at the

* It is much to be regretted that in a popular work on Voltaire in a series edited by Mrs. Oliphant, this poem is alluded to as if it were a playful burlesque. We feel certain that this is an oversight due to ignorance of the work.

† Notice of Voltaire by Victor Hugo, in the first volume of " Littérature et Philosophie Mêlées," published by Hachette, in 1864.

‡ " Les Rayons et les Ombres."

same time doing a good action and a good stroke of business. If there is ignorant fanaticism in the world, it is the fanaticism of the Liberal worshippers of Voltaire.

We have said enough, and yet we have left untouched many of the points of the indictment against Voltaire. The subject is not one upon which we care to dwell more than is absolutely necessary. He lived a horrible life, he died a horrible death; but his works still live, and will live, perpetuating his evil work, as long as there exists the language in which he wrote. All homage done to him is an outrage against every noble ideal, an insult to purity, to faith, to Jesus Christ. Against such homage it is the duty of all who can hold a pen to protest. France has protested by the voice of one of her greatest prelates, and we end as we began, by thanking him for his protest.

ART. II.—CHRISTIAN CHARITY AND POLITICAL ECONOMY.—PART III.

The Christian and Civic Economy of Large Towns. By DR. THOMAS CHALMERS. Vol. II. Glasgow. 1823.

Geschichte der kirchlichen Armenpflege, von GEORG RATZINGER. Freiburg im Breisgau. 1868.

Pauperism: its Causes and its Remedies. By HENRY FAWCETT. 1871.

Our Laws and Our Poor. By FRANCIS PEEK. 1875.

WE propose in this article to complete the general theory of charity set forth in two former articles,* and to show the mischief that is inevitable, or likely, if the civil government takes upon itself the relief of the poor. Whether there are exceptional cases, in which this relief is to be permitted or to be desired, we hope to make clear. Our main attack will be upon the system of compulsory poor-relief, as in England, where the State both raises and administers the funds for relief; but we shall also briefly notice the system of mere "official" poor-relief, as it is called, where the State does not raise but only administers the fund for the poor, which past or present benevolence supplies.

As to compulsory poor-relief we must begin with the remark that certain writers, opponents of it like ourselves, seem to weaken their case by exaggeration; for, bad as are the necessary

* See the DUBLIN REVIEW for October, 1877, and January, 1878.

or probable results, there is a limit to their number and virulence; and we must take care not to assert that some bad result is inevitable on the ground that it has been produced by the English Poor-law. If we use such reasoning from the particular to the general, we must allow others to use it against ourselves, and not object, for example, to the conclusion that charity inevitably demoralizes, because the disorganized charities of Protestant London demoralize (supposing, indeed, this charge against them is true). But if we say we cannot be answerable for the effects of charity when the conditions for its efficacy are disregarded, we must allow the defenders of compulsory poor-relief to distinguish the abuse from the use of their system, and in their turn to erect conditions of efficacy. And then we shall have to show, either that such conditions are unattainable, or else, that even if they mitigate they do not avert certain disastrous results. It is also not enough to show that compulsory poor-relief has bad effects, but we must also answer the arguments, such as are found, for example, in so well-known a book as Mill's "*Political Economy*," that there would be worse effects from its absence. We are conscious that by these remarks we have imposed upon ourselves a serious obligation, and undertaken a burdensome task; nor are we without misgivings that in the subsequent discussion we may give occasion for a critical reader to reproach us with having fallen into faults, for which, as we have noted them in others, we have forfeited all claim to indulgence. Let us, however, no longer delay our attack.

First, we will dismiss certain arguments on our side that would only encumber us. One is that compulsory poor-relief, as giving to the poor what is practically, sometimes even formally, a right to relief, fosters communistic ideas.* We give no opinion on this charge; only to those who make it we commend the fact, if true, that whereas there has been much resemblance between the poor-relief of England and Denmark, perhaps no two other European countries are more in contrast as to the prevalence of communistic ideas. Another argument is, that compulsory poor-relief reduces the wages of the labouring classes; † a third, that they are encouraged by it to marry recklessly and prematurely with an unnatural and disastrous increase of population as the result. Renouncing all claim to make use of these arguments, we come to some others which we think are tenable; only we lay little stress upon them, preferring to let the issue be decided on other grounds. It can be

* Stöckl, "*Lehrbuch der Philosophie*," § 176.

† Ratzinger, "*Geschichte der kirchlichen Armenpflege*," p. 401. Chalmers, "*Political Economy*," ch. xiv. 2nd ed. 1832.

said that compulsory poor-relief is extremely likely to increase the number of the poor, as even if the funds for the support of paupers are nominally drawn only from the rich, the extra pressure of taxation is sure ultimately to fall in part upon the lower classes, and those already on the brink of destitution are pushed into the gulf. Again, it can be said that compulsory poor-relief implies a contradiction; that no limit is put to the numbers to be relieved from a limited fund; that the resources of Government have a limit as certain, though more remote than the resources of individuals. Whether it is a satisfactory answer to say that this contradiction is a mere remote possibility, we much doubt. Several instances are given in the Extract from the Report on the Poor-laws in 1833* of parishes obliged for lack of funds to abandon the poor, and the notable case is recorded of Cholesbury, in Bucks, where, in 1833, out of a population of 129 inhabitants, sixty-six had relief; the poor-rate rose to 32s. in the pound, out of 100 acres of arable land only 16 remained in cultivation, and private charity was needed to support the inhabitants. Ten years before this Dr. Chalmers had pointed out † that far from a poor-rate being a sufficient remedy against the vicissitudes of industry, "there never occurs a season of distressed trade and reduced wages, when the heavily assessed towns of England have not recourse to the very shifts that are practised in other places for meeting the adversity of the times." So, notably, in the calamitous winter of 1816-17 there was as much need in England of supplementary help,—subscriptions, soup-kitchens, and the like—as in Scotch towns where compulsion was in its infancy or unknown.‡ And the same failure of the State relief and need of private charity has been seen in the recent or actual distress in South Wales, as to which we will give an extract from an interesting article in the "Spectator" of the 19th of January last:—

They [the workmen in South Wales] are one and all in the condition which the Poor-law is expressly designed to meet, the condition, that is, of men for whom there is no work, however willing they are to do it. But the Poor-

* Apud Naville, "De la Charité légale," ii. note xi. (Paris. 1836).

† Chalmers, "Christian and Civic Economy of Large Towns," vol. ii. p. 252, note.

‡ As an illustration of the inefficacy of poor-rates, Chalmers (l. c. pp. 233, 234, note) gives the case of the parish of Darlaston, in Staffordshire. The population, almost exclusively mining and manufacturing, fell into distress in 1816, and the rates surpassed £2,000. They could not have gone higher; for the householders would have removed, and the landowners have abandoned the land. As it was, private charity subscribed over £2,400, and the distress was tided over.

law is paralyzed in presence of the fact that the classes by whom the Poor-rate is mainly contributed, are themselves in a condition which, if the demand [for relief] were made equal to the need, would, as regards many of them, be scarcely distinguishable from that of the workmen. This will always be a difficulty in districts where the ratepayers mainly belong to the Middle Class, and derive their income from feeding, or clothing, or curing the workmen around them. The Poor-law is an excellent [?] instrument for dealing with accidental cases of destitution, or for constant and recurrent destitution, when it affects only a small class, such as sick people or old people. But it never can stand alone in presence of so vast a calamity as that under which South Wales is now suffering, for the simple reason that the principle of a poor law implies the relief of local distress out of local funds, and in cases like this, the local distress eats up the local funds.

The disastrous alternative of giving relief not out of local but out of national funds will be spoken of later; and it is enough to say here that this measure does not remove the contradiction between unlimited claims and limited resources. Another and a worse alternative does indeed seek to limit the possible claims by restrictions to marriage. Ratzinger notices * the connection between the obligation of the parishes (communes) to support their poor, and the checks to marriage and settlement. In Bavaria the poor man was for a long period condemned to forced celibacy for the sake of the parish finances. Some of the odious regulations of his time, the result of compulsory poor-relief, are to be found in Naville's book on *Legal Charity*, published in 1836. The law sometimes, he says, "demands of the bride and bridegroom not only that they shall pay back any relief they may have had, but also that they shall not have received any for a given period, varying with the locality. It is four years in the canton of Schwyz, twelve in Unterwalden In Fribourg, Bern, St. Gall, and Unterwalden, the bride and bridegroom have to pay a certain sum into the fund for the poor. At Freiburg, in Breisgau, and Frankfort-on-the-Main they have to prove that they have sufficient means of subsistence. At Donaueschingen, in Thurgau, they must have 200 florins (about £26). . . . In Schwyz marriage is forbidden not only to those who have received any relief within the four previous years, but also to those whose father, mother, brothers, or sisters have so received."† The liability to cause such violations of personal liberty may well be urged as an objection against compulsory poor-relief.

But now it is time to come to our main arguments, which we will put under four heads:—First, compulsory poor-relief

* Ratzinger, "*Geschichte der kirchlichen Armenpflege*," p. 389.

† Naville, "*De la Charité légale*," i. pp. 112, 113, 115, 116.

converts what was a joy into a burden. For those utilitarians, who tire us with their greatest happiness for the greatest number, this objection should have much weight. The delight a man feels in giving to the poor, and seeing his wealth the means of spreading happiness around him, is changed into the unpleasant obligation of paying the local taxes, and perhaps the bitter vexation of knowing that the funds thus forcibly taken from him are used in a manner which he thinks most pernicious.

Secondly, compulsory poor-relief, since it comes not from the heart, speaks not to the heart; since it is claimed as a right, engenders no gratitude. The recipients are liable to be embittered by the perhaps unexpected smallness of what they receive. There can be none of the ennobling and improving influence of that help which comes from the love of the poor. The main points are the legal proof of poverty and the legal material relief; and instead of gratitude and moral reform, it is more likely that ingratitude and insolence will be fostered, and perhaps all shame at living at the cost of others be gradually extinguished.*

Thirdly, a terrible blow is struck at voluntary poor-relief. By this we do not mean to assert or imply that in a given country where there is compulsory poor-relief less is spent on the poor than would be spent if all relief were voluntary. On mere *a priori* grounds it could be said that if by the burden of a poor-rate the charitable are unable to give so much as they would were they freed from it, and if many think their whole duty done by paying the poor-rate, many on the other hand, who else would have given nothing, are compelled to contribute towards the support of the destitute. And *a posteriori* the case is equally obscure. What evidence is there from experience to show that the abolition of forced poor-relief would cause a corresponding permanent increase of private almsgiving? All we can say is that the one instance of the vast private almsgiving co-existing in London with compulsory poor-relief overthrows the rash generalization that compulsory poor-relief dries up the sources of private charity.† But then, it may be asked, how can we venture to assert that a terrible blow is struck at voluntary poor-relief? We answer that, were the material gift the main point, we should indeed not have thus ventured. But,

* Ratzinger, l. c. p. 401, seq. In a report of 1817, cited by Lord Robert Montagu, "Pauperism," p. 3, is well said: "As it proceeds from no impulse of charity, it creates no feeling of gratitude, and not unfrequently engenders dispositions and habits calculated to separate rather than unite the interests of the higher and lower orders of the community."

† Périn, "De la Richesse," ii. p. 405 (2nd ed.), seems to fall into this mistake.

as we explained in a former article, the main point is not the gift but the word; that is, the moral reform of the poor. And true Christian charity in seeking this reform finds a terrible hindrance in the existence of compulsory poor-relief. Precisely those who are at the bottom of the social scale and are in most need of reform, are those to whom the hardships that may be attached to State poor-relief are least repulsive; and who will prefer to make use of such relief to escape the reform of their bad habits, or even the constant exhortations to a better life, which are the conditions, to them so unwelcome, of Christian help. This truth is urged by Ratzinger (l. c. p. 421, note 3) against those who desire a State poor-relief as supplementary to voluntary charity. Among other things, he says:—

We cannot expect the evils of pauperism to be remedied by a Church poor-relief, so long as this has to compete with the State poor-relief, for the simple reason that precisely the most dangerous elements withdraw themselves from the influence of ecclesiastical charity finding it much more agreeable to live at the cost of the State. The idea of organising two poor-reliefs independent of each other is, in my opinion simply monstrous.

The fourth, and most serious charge we make against compulsory poor-relief is that it either demoralizes the poor or treats them with cruelty, or is both corrupting and cruel; and that no poor-law reform can give escape from the terrible dilemma. And, first, we will suppose the case of State poor-relief granted with facility, and without being attached to very onerous conditions, poor-relief, in short, such as was general in England before 1834, and is still we believe by no means uncommon. Such relief can hardly fail to be indiscriminate. Mr. Mill well remarks ("Political Economy," bk. v. ch. xi. § 13):—

The State must act by general rules. It cannot undertake to discriminate between the deserving and the undeserving indigent. It owes no more than subsistence to the first, and can give no less to the last.* What is said about the injustice of a law which has no better treatment for the merely unfortunate poor than for the ill-conducted, is founded on a misconception of the province of law and public authority. The dispensers of public relief have no business to be inquisitors. Guardians and overseers are not fit to be trusted to give or withhold other people's money, according to their verdict upon the morality of the person soliciting it; and it would show much ignorance of the ways of mankind to suppose that such persons, even in the almost impossible case of their being qualified, will take the trouble of ascertaining and sifting the past conduct of a person in distress, so as to form a rational judgment on it.

* This sentence presupposes that the State owes subsistence to the "deserving poor" and even to the undeserving. We do not admit this debt in either case.

But further, it is likely that the bold and noisy will get most, while the timid and modest are overlooked. Some sort of proof of poverty must be exacted, and then, as Ratzinger notices,—

The modest poor man, who will not expose himself before a board and prove to them his indigence—a requisition mocking all deeper and nobler feelings—is overlooked . . . may starve ; whereas the bold petitioner, the shameless debauchee, is the person for whom the State poor-relief really exists. Startling are the accounts given us by men having experience in these matters. . . . Prostitutes, if they only have boldness enough, are in a better plight with their illegitimate children than most of the honest wives and mothers with their families (l. c. p. 403).

The disastrous effects of what is known in England as lax outdoor relief have often been dwelt on—the idleness, improvidence, extravagance, drunkenness, debauchery, and heart-rending neglect of family duties. Lord Lyttelton, in the “*Contemporary Review*,” June, 1875 (pp. 178, 179), says among other things :—

It not only discourages forethought, thrift, and self-denial, but sharply marks them out as folly. . . . That which, I am very sure, is far the worst plague-spot of pauperism, in the purely moral and social view—that which, after not very far from forty years’ experience, fills me with fresh indignation at every fresh instance—and not a day passes at any Board of Guardians without fresh instances—is the inversion, the oblivion, the annihilation, caused, or tending to be caused, by a poor law, of the family affections, and the sense of family obligations.

And he cites an old report :—

It is as difficult to convey to the mind of the reader a true and faithful impression of the intensity and malignancy of the evil, as it is by any description, however vivid, to give an adequate idea of the horror of a shipwreck or a pestilence. A person must converse with paupers, must enter workhouses and examine the inmates, must attend at the parish pay-table, before he can form any idea of the moral debasement which is the offspring of the present system. He must hear the pauper threaten to abandon his wife and family unless more money is allowed him—threaten to abandon an aged, bedridden mother, to turn her out of his house and lay her down at the overseer’s door, unless he is paid for giving her shelter ; he must hear parents threaten to follow the same course with regard to their sick children ; he must see mothers coming to receive the reward of their daughters’ ignominy, and witness women in cottages quietly pointing out, without even the question being asked, which are their children by their husband, and which by other men previous to marriage ; and scarcely is there a town or parish without some instance or other of this character.

And Lord Lyttelton adds :—

These words . . . may no longer be literally applicable anywhere. But will any of us, familiar with the working of the law, say that the difference is in kind, and not only in degree ?

In the "Fortnightly Review," April, 1875, Mr. W. H. Roberts works out the fourfold accusation against the poor-laws that they keep down the wages of the farm labourer, destroy his self-reliance and independence of character, train him in the use of subterfuge and deceit, and deaden to an appalling extent his natural affections. Much as we dislike compulsory poor-relief, we by no means refer these and like evils exclusively to the poor-laws, but in great part to neglect of their duty by employers and landlords. However, it can scarcely be questioned that the poor-laws have taken a part in the production of the mischief; and if the reader will recall our defence of Christian charity against similar charges, he will remember that two important points of this defence were, first, the union of the material with the moral gift, so that no one could receive relief for long, and yet be undisturbed in his vices; and secondly, the simultaneous teaching of the Church as to the duty of labour, of self-denial, and of the mutual obligations of the members of a family. But these safeguards are absent from compulsory poor-relief.

From this horn of the dilemma let us pass to the other, where there is severity instead of laxity. Mr. Mill ("Polit. Economy," bk. v. ch. xi. § 13) approves the principle that help available to all, and able to be calculated upon, should be such as to leave a strong motive to do without it. This was the principle of the Poor Law of 1834. And he thinks that probably in every country it is possible to secure that those supported by legal charity, while guaranteed against absolute want, can be kept in a condition "considerably less desirable" than those who support themselves. Otherwise "the system strikes at the root of all individual industry." Most true. Only that this undesirability can (in most countries, if not all) be alone secured by treating the poor as criminals—by disgrace, discomfort, or imprisonment; and this is a cruel wrong. Chastisement is put in the place of charity, and poverty is treated as a crime. Lord Lyttelton, indeed, finds fault with this last "hackneyed saying" as fallacious. We ought rather to say that the severe administrators of compulsory poor-relief find poverty a misfortune, and leave it so ("Contemporary Review," June, 1875, p. 189). But this answer rather is fallacious. Because a man has fallen into one misfortune, namely poverty, is that a reason for inflicting upon him another, as imprisonment or disgrace? Some of the amiable modes that have been devised of leaving poverty a misfortune shall be given from Naville:—

At Copenhagen those receiving relief have to send their children to special schools called Poor Schools. . . . In Appenzell, Bern, Aargau, and Unter-

walden the circumstances that could give the poor man the possession of any property are watched, so as to take back what he has received, and even after his death it is claimed from his heirs. In some parishes of the same canton of Appenzell the names of those relieved are published at the church. At Fribourg they are posted up in the public-houses, and are read at the general assembly of the arrondissement. In Aargau they are read every three months at the petty council. . . . At Trieste and in the cantons of Unterwalden and Thurgau paupers are held up to disgrace by having to wear certain special clothes or marks on their clothes. . . . In Unterwalden they are even forbidden games and dancing, and are led to church under inspection. . . . In Bavaria they are forbidden to stay outside the place of their domicile without a special permission, only to be granted for serious reasons, and they are severely punished if they break this rule. In Bern and in the duchy of Nassau, if they lack respect or submission to the officers, they are punished with severe imprisonment, or with forced and degrading labour. . . . At Fribourg, in Switzerland, the poor who do not work are imprisoned and put on bread and water for forty-eight hours ; nor is the plea allowed that they have not been able to find work. For repetition of the offence the imprisonment is prolonged progressively up to six months. . . . In this invidious treatment legal charity makes no distinction of persons ; it is not misconduct, but poverty, that is struck at and marked with ignominy. There is no inquiry into the causes of misery. A man needing momentary help through some unforeseen accident is treated like the careless and unfeeling who do not mind living at the public expense ; a man forced to ask help through blameless poverty meets the same fate as the drunken and extravagant.*

In England, as is well known, the great panacea for abuse has been the strict application of the workhouse test, the alternative, namely, of receiving nothing or of entering the workhouse. This is the principle of the Act of 1834, and there has been (at least in the Metropolitan districts) a recent revival of its application. Mr. A. S. Harvey, in the "*Contemporary Review*," Jan., 1876 (on "*The Pauper Abroad*"), p. 278, looks forward to the abolition of all outdoor relief as the ideal ; Professor Fawcett seems to desire it ; and Lord Lyttelton urges it, and thinks five years' notice of the measure would be a sufficient interval ("*Contemporary Review*," June, 1875, pp. 184-187). And the workhouse, according to Lord Lyttelton (*ibid.*), is to be on the same general principle to all its inmates, repellent to all, and not inviting to the old and infirm, lest there be discouragement of industry and forethought, extortion of what one needs from others often nearly as poor as oneself, and, above all, the destruction of the sense of duty among kindred.

Against this alternative of severity we urge, first, that to

* Naville, "*De la Charité légale*," i. pp. 104-109.

treat simple poverty in such a way is to display a horrible spectacle, perhaps more demoralizing to the community at large than lax outdoor relief is to the poor. The honour and love due to the poor are changed into disgrace and reproof, and the sight of poverty unrelieved, even were this the sole alternative, would be less disastrous than the sight of poverty dishonoured and punished; nor perhaps could any more effective mode be discovered, than this severity to the poor, of bringing home to all the conviction that wealth is the aim of life and the one thing worth living and striving for. And, secondly, severity is by no means sure to lessen much the number of the applicants for relief. This is not badly explained in the following passage from Dr. Chalmers, where also the mischievous effect of these measures is observed:—

Even though the discipline of a workhouse should at length be perfectly assimilated to that of a gaol, we fear that, like many other of the legal scarecrows which have been devised, its only reaction would be in working down the taste and character of the people to its own standard. In proportion as the law multiplied its severities, would pauperism acquire a stouter stomach for the digestion of them; and those regulations which at first might deter, will, at length, be got over, because of a now fiercer and harder and more resolute population. We have at all times exceedingly doubted the policy of . . . expedients . . . in terrorem. . . . They may repel some of those who are of a better or finer temperament than their neighbours; but in by far the greater number of instances will they blunt the delicacies which are thus handled so rudely. After a temporary subsidence of pauperism there will be a reflux, and, worse than the heavy expenditure, we shall behold a deteriorated *morale*, a more sullen and impracticable population. This holds eminently and conspicuously true of one set of expedients—those by which pauperism is made as affronting as possible. Everything has been tried in this way, and often with great temporary, but never, we believe, with permanent success. It is indeed a most mischievous ordeal, and never fails ultimately to degrade the poor without any saving to the wealthy. The badges, and the publication of names, and the posting them in conspicuous places, may all work a recoil from pauperism for a time, but only to come back with accumulated force, and with a more sturdy and unmanageable character than before. . . . The law of pauperism . . . may be regarded as a compound of temptations on the one hand and of severities on the other; and with the latter it has awkwardly attempted to neutralize the mischief of the former. The practical effect of the whole has been to form two distinct classes or characters of population, which stand more widely and remotely contrasted in England than they do, we believe, in any other country of Europe. The one is a pure, and a noble, and a high-minded class, who of course would be revolted by the severities of pauperism. The other yield to her temptations, and by weathering the brunt of her severities, their meanness and corruption have only been rendered more inveterate. . . . They transmit their habit to their descendants, and this is the reason why

pauperism is so apt to fix, as if by a hereditary settlement, in families. There is thus a mass of corruption that never will be got rid of but with the extinction of this boasted charity by law. . . . Its severities, in fact, are alike hurtful with its temptations. It is not by playing the one against the other that any substantial or abiding reformation will be gained. There must be a way devised by which to cancel both." (*"Christ. and Civic Econ.,"* ii. pp. 280-284.)

And as to the "workhouse test," we may further notice that the separation of husband and wife, of parents and children, violates the sacred rights of the family, and in so doing injures the respect for the family tie; thus fostering the very evil which Lord Lyttelton considers the worst feature of lax outdoor relief. And then there is, we think, an inevitable spread of corruption even in the best-regulated workhouse, through the impossibility of separating the immoral poor from the rest, and every workhouse is of necessity a moral pest-house. How this is the case even now we can gather from the following passage in Mr. Francis Peek's interesting little book on "*Our Laws and Our Poor*":—

The want of proper discrimination in the management of our poor-law relief is one of the worst defects of the present system; it begins in the workhouse nurseries and schoolrooms, where the orphan children of the deserving poor are herded with the children of the refuse of society; it is continued among the able-bodied, when the virtuous widow is sent to pick oakum among the most degraded of her sex; it extends even to the death-bed, where the poor invalid who, to save herself from such a fate, has worked till she could work no longer, and starved till she could starve no longer, is carried from her wretched home to linger out life's last hours in a bed, on each side of which may lie depraved wretches whose every word is foulness or blasphemy (pp. 16, 17). Two things . . . are most dreaded by all the respectable poor, . . . the pauper nurses and the heedless mingling of the vilest characters with the respectable sick. One or two of these vile men or women in a room will render the lives of the rest unbearable (pp. 19, 20).

The mingling orphans with others is no doubt a needless abuse; but the mingling of vicious adults with the rest, and, worse still, the mingling of vicious children of depraved parents with the other children, are inevitable evils. Who is to discriminate between the respectable and the disreputable, between the deserving and undeserving? Mr. Fawcett, indeed, thinks ("*Pauperism*," pp. 45, 46) that the demoralization alleged to spring from workhouses, as far as true, is remediable by proper management. Let there be good discipline, judicious classification, constant supervision. "The discipline enforced may be regulated according to the general character and circumstances of the individual inmates; those who have brought indigence

upon themselves by their own vices should be subjected to a much more severe treatment than those whose poverty is due to misfortunes which they had no power to control." But has Mr. Fawcett forgotten the words of his master, Mr. Mill, cited above, p. 403, on the need of the State acting by general rules, and on the unfitness of the distributors of public relief being inquisitors, and judges of the morality of the applicants? Has he seriously thought what a fearful court of censorship he would set up, what arbitrary power he gives to the judges on the delicate issue between misfortune and fault? And the measure would not merely be tyrannical but also inefficient; for many clever scoundrels could dress up an unanswerable case for admission among the virtuous, while many honest, but unpractised and unskilful poor would for only small or seeming faults be classed among the vicious.

But, perhaps, now we shall be told that England is behind the age; that we have indeed been right in condemning the workhouse system, the inevitable evils of which have been proved by Professor Gneist, of Vienna;* but that the enlightened philanthropy of our century has devised a mode of out-door relief that does not demoralize the poor, this advantage being obtained by elaborate inquisition and constant supervision; and that a brilliant example of this kind of relief is seen in the Prussian town of Elberfeld. Let us, then, look at the leading features of the Elberfeld poor-relief.† To simplify the description we will first mention that there is a certain amount of indoor relief (in a Poorhouse, Orphanage, and Infirmary), but that there is no "workhouse test," for no one is admitted to indoor relief who would not be entitled to out-door relief. The organization of this latter is what concerns us. At the head are nine guardians, below them eighteen overseers, and below these 250 visitors; all three classes being elected for three years by the municipal council.‡ These offices are compulsory, and unpaid. The guardians conduct the central administration. The town is divided into districts—each under an overseer, and the districts are subdivided into sections, each assigned to a visitor. A meeting of the visitors in every district is held at least once a fortnight under the presidency of

* See "Report on Poor Laws in Foreign Countries, Accounts and Papers," 1875, vol. lkv. p. 367, in the report on Crefeld, by Herr Seyffardt, who sings a hymn of praise to the Elberfeld poor-relief and to modern civilization.

† Our account is gathered from Mr. Doyle's report in the "Report on Poor Laws in Foreign Countries, Accounts and Papers," 1875, vol. lkv. and from the Elberfeld Armenordnung und Instruction, revised, 1876.

‡ With this difference, that the members of the last two classes are proposed by the first. To complete the personnel, we should add the managers of the poor-house, infirmary, &c.

the overseer. Applications for relief have to be made to a visitor, and he brings the case before the next district meeting, where all is settled by vote, though the overseer can appeal to the guardians. Such briefly is the organization of the poor-law officers. As to the conditions of relief, any one has a claim to it who lacks the absolute necessities of life, and who cannot get or do work, provided there be no persons, notably his kindred or his master, bound to support him.* If he gets anything by private charity or partial employment, the State poor-relief will only add as much as is needful to make up what is absolutely necessary (*das unabweislich Nothwendige*). Nor is the judgment of the amount left to the discretion of the visitor, but there is a money scale of necessity according to age and sex. Moreover, the recipient must be willing to do any work assigned to him, and must submit to examination and constant inspection by the visitor. This examination is, according to Mr. Doyle, so inquisitorial, "that no man who could possibly escape from it would submit to it." Age, religion, place of birth, length of residence, particulars as to the health of all the members of the family, whether and where the children go to school, the causes of the poverty, and many other particulars are noted down by the visitor. The former inquiry, whether the poor man had reported himself to the police, and obtained permission to reside has, we believe, been abolished since the French war by a new law of settlement. But the inquiry remains whether the family leads a blameless (*unbescholtenes*) life, or which of the members do not. The pauper has to keep a wages book, in which the employer enters his earnings; moreover, there is a special column for remarks in which the employer is begged to record unrelentingly (*unnachsichtig*) whenever the holder of the book has been guilty of want of industry, of disorderly conduct, or of any other offence. The visitor is bound to visit the house of the pauper at least once a fortnight, and ascertain if any changes have occurred in the circumstances of the family. He has to repress any disorder or vice, exhort to order, cleanliness, and honesty, urge the mutual duties of parents and children, and, in the words of the rules, "clothed with the dignity of an organ of the town government, seek in general to gain a wholesome influence over the moral feeling of the poor person."

Such, in outline, is the Elberfeld system; and to us it seems scarcely better able to stand criticism than the strict workhouse test, or any other form of compulsory poor-relief. First of all,

* The German law on the strict mutual duty of support among kindred, and on the obligation of masters to support their servants or workmen, who have met with accidents in their employment, might, perhaps, be applied with advantage in England.

there is the peculiar feature of compulsory service. A man may be compelled to act as visitor of the poor; and this compulsion can well be denounced as a violation of personal liberty. And then three of the main objections given above to compulsory poor-relief seem applicable also here. The payment is a legal tax, not the joyous gift of charity. There is no occasion for gratitude or opening for moral reform, and a blow is struck at voluntary charity. The second charge might, indeed, be indignantly denied. The visitor, it is said, is to be the friend and adviser of the poor, and to exercise, as we have seen from the rules, a healthy influence over his moral feelings. But even supposing the visitor (perhaps a Jew or apostate) was in himself capable of exercising the said healthy influence, the circumstances under which he approaches the unfortunate, offering them the minimum subsistence at the cost of submitting to an insulting inquisition, of making, as it were, a general confession to a layman, bound not to silence, but to disclosure; of becoming like criminals under surveillance, with their domestic privacy invaded, their feelings of honour wounded—such circumstances are, to say the least, scarcely propitious for introducing a moral reform. It is effectual to urge morality and the duties of parents and children in the name of God, but hardly in the name of the—of the town government! It has been well said:

The State proceeds to *command* the relief of the poor, when charity—*free* charity—is alone in a position to exercise it. The State as such has no knowledge of charity. It only knows justice and police, and only has organs for these ends. But law courts and police officers can do nothing effectual against poverty and its consequences. For centuries the State has shown that it is not equal to this task, and is still less so now, the more it becomes plain how close is the connection between moral and material indigence, and how, in most cases, sin is to be found, sometimes as the cause, sometimes as the consequence of distress. Here the State with its power and money, its laws and officers, is altogether insufficient.*

And finally, can it be said that this boasted Elberfeld system escapes the fourth objection to compulsory poor-relief, the dilemma of cruelty or demoralization? Is it not cruel and indiscriminate? The honest and upright workman, who has fallen into poverty through no fault of his own, is subjected, like the idle and immoral, to that examination so inquisitorial "that no man who could possibly escape from it would submit to it," and to those various minute regulations made "to discourage applications, save under circumstances of absolute necessity."†

* Ratzinger, "Geschichte der kirchl. Armenpflege," pp. 405, 406 (citing Schunk).

† Doyle, l. c. pp. 353, 355.

And by the dishonour shown to poverty the whole community is liable to be demoralized, as we have already urged. Nor let any one urge the practical success of the Elberfeld system, and show us authentic tables of the great reduction in the number of paupers at Elberfeld since the introduction (in 1853-1854) of this system, as also at Barmen and Crefeld, while in the neighbouring towns of Düsseldorf and Aix-la-Chapelle, which have not adopted this system, there is more pauperism and heavier expenditure. For such statistics do not show in the least that there is less distress in the towns where this "reformed" poor-relief prevails, since many may suffer almost anything rather than ask help attached to such odious conditions. True, there is success, so far as the end is to reduce the poor-rates; and so far the Elberfeld system has an undoubted advantage over lax out-door relief. But then how much more surely and fully would this end be accomplished by following our proposal, and abolishing State poor-relief altogether.

Let us, however, admit, as regards the Elberfeld and kindred systems, that if the visitors are excellent and devoted men, some of its evils are mitigated, and there is a certain benefit from the personal intercourse between the rich and the poor. We do not wish to throw the smallest doubt upon the zeal and philanthropy of the Elberfeld visitors and overseers. But even here we must lament the waste of qualities which might have been so much better employed in the voluntary service of the poor. And against those who would introduce the Elberfeld system into England let us notice that its success in reducing the State expenditure on the poor seems connected with local and perhaps temporary circumstances which are absent in England. We lack those strict measures of German police and checks to free locomotion which seem to have been made use of in the administration of the Elberfeld poor-laws.* And Mr. Doyle well

* Mr. Doyle, in an annotation to his report thinks this administration may be injured by the recent diminution of strictness. But the following law, which we give as cited in § 51 of the "Elberfeld Instruction," 1876, seems still in force:—"By § 361 of the penal code is punished with imprisonment—(1) Whosoever so far abandons himself to play, drink, or idleness, as to fall into a state in which relief must be asked from the authorities for himself, or for those whom he is bound to support; (2) whosoever receiving relief from the public funds refuses through dislike of work to do the work, suitable to his strength, set him by the authorities; (3) whosoever, after loss of his previous employment, does not within the space of time fixed by the competent authority get fresh employment, or prove that he has not been able to obtain such in spite of his efforts. By § 362, *ibid.*, to the sentence of imprisonment can be added, that the offender, after his punishment is over, be handed over to the local police (*Landespolizeibehörde*), who are empowered either to place him for not more than two years in an *Arbeitshaus* (house of correction?), or to employ him on public works."

urges against the substitution of a system of this kind for our workhouse test that "such inquiry, to be efficient, must be of a most inquisitorial character . . . conducted by agents peculiarly qualified by intelligence and social position . . . not involve more labour and time than men engaged in . . . active occupations . . . can be reasonably expected to devote to it. These are conditions that it is difficult to obtain at all—almost impossible to secure permanently." He notes how at Hamburg, where ninety years ago a poor-relief, resembling that of modern Elberfeld, was introduced, there was success as long as the original visitors lasted, but, we gather, not afterwards.* He doubts "whether such a system of inquisition would be permanently accepted by any class of people in this country," and is sure that the class of people needed for working it would never give it the time and attention without which it would simply aggravate our present imperfect system of inquiry. "The experiment," he adds, "has been tried in this country, and tried under exceptionally favourable circumstances, but, I regret to say, has not succeeded. Even in Elberfeld, as was anticipated, the question begins to be discussed whether a workhouse is not an indispensable supplement to the system of strict personal investigation." †

Finally, let us notice a dilemma as to the respective areas of relief and taxation. The Elberfeld system seems to imply that both shall be narrow; but then we fall into the injustice of possible vast inequalities of the local poor-rates, as formerly in England, where, e.g. in 1868-69, the rate in Bethnal Green was 3s. 7½d., but in Paddington 8½d. (Fawcett, "Pauperism," p. 64, *seq.*). Mr. Peek, while keeping the area of relief narrow, wishes the area of taxation wide, in order to equalize the burden ("Our Laws and Our Poor," pp. 23, 24). But then we fall upon the other horn of the dilemma; for with human nature as it is, if the local distributors of relief know that the burden on their locality will only be affected imperceptibly by their own parsimony and prodigality, and that their parsimony may be nullified by the prodigality of others, they are too likely to prefer to purchase the popularity of generosity when nine-tenths of the price is paid by others. ‡

* The interesting account of Hamburg in "Emminghaus' Armenwesen," is unfortunately one of the essays omitted in the (abridged) English translation, revised by E. B. Eastwick, 1873.

† "Accounts and Papers," 1875, vol. lxx. pp. 29, 31.

‡ So Mr. Fawcett vigorously opposes a national poor-rate, which, he thinks, would remove all effectual check upon extravagant administration ("Pauperism," pp. 64, 65). Mr. Peek ("Our Laws and Our Poor," pp. 20-25) strongly urges to begin the reform of the poor-laws by introducing discrimination, impossible now through the short time given to consider applications

We have now given our objections to compulsory poor-relief, whether in or out of a workhouse, whether lax or severe. But we have yet to answer certain arguments in its defence. Of these the chief seems the argument from the right to life. Mr. Mill (*"Polit. Econ.,"* V. xi. 13) says the State owes no more than subsistence to the deserving indigent, and can give no less to the undeserving; and he speaks of a minimum due even to the worst. Lord Ellenborough in 1803 laid down that the law of humanity, anterior to all positive laws, obliged us to afford relief even to aliens to save them from starving. Lord Lyttelton, after citing this judgment (*"Contemp. Rev.,"* June, 1875, pp. 174, 175), thinks "the opposite would be inconsistent not merely with the dictates of revealed and even of natural religion, but those of universal instinct, at least among tolerably civilized people."* And if the indigent have such a claim and the State has such a duty, compulsory poor-relief seems called for to satisfy the claim and fulfil the duty.

To this argument some may answer by denying the alleged right to life. Lord Lyttelton's view is not universal. In the same periodical, three months later, we see a clergyman, the Rev. W. W. Edwards, proposing the abolition of the poor-law; thinking the view that no one need starve to be against the principle of nature that man shall die if he will not work; and warning us not to remove this remedy against sloth and unthrift, and violate the law of nature by our poor-laws (*"Contemp. Rev.,"* Sept. 1875, p. 26). Why, it may be asked should the frugal and industrious be forced to sacrifice a portion of their hardily-won gains to support the idle, drunken, and profligate? And is not the end of the State, as of private property and other social institutions, to enable us, not merely

(the maximum time being three minutes per case, the minimum nearly three cases per minute!); let the parishes and unions be subdivided for the purpose of administration; let there be (we gather) a great increase in the number of relieving officers and guardians; and let men of education and judgment take a larger share in the management of parochial affairs, and be the real guardians of the poor, so as to check imposture and keep the deserving poor from bodily and mental suffering. But, putting aside other criticisms, as that something more than education and judgment are needed for the service of the poor, let us once more remark that the question is *how* to discriminate among paupers, how, without the danger of immense injustice, to distinguish as distinct legal classes the "deserving" and "undeserving"? The delicate gradations of misconduct, and the manifold modifying circumstances, can be understood by free charity, but are quite unfit to be the ground of definite legal rules.

* Analogous views of Grotius, Montesquieu, Necker, and the Mendicity Committee of the French Constituent Assembly (*La société doit à tous ses membres subsistance et travail*), are given by Périn, *"De la Richesse,"* ii. pp. 421, 422. 2nd edit.

to live, but to live rightly? And is not death, even by starvation, better than a bad life? But this answer is not one which, as Catholics, we feel authorized to use. For the right to life, at any rate in a certain sense, seems implied in the Catholic doctrine, that a man in extreme necessity may take from another without any sin what is enough for his immediate support.* We prefer, then, to say that from this doctrine does not follow any duty of the civil government to relieve the poor. The Church says, a starving man may in this extremity use another's property without sin *in foro interno*. But she does not, we imagine, forbid the State to look on the man's action as theft, and to punish him as guilty *in foro externo*. Again, the Church says the rich man is bound, under pain of grievous sin, to relieve the starving man, and in general to give alms; but (according to the more probable opinion) if he neglects this duty he is not bound to restitution, has not sinned against justice, but only against charity.† And if the teaching on extreme necessity implied the normal duty of the State to relieve the poor, such relief would hardly have been denounced by eminent Catholic writers. M. Périn, the professor at Louvain, urges the need of charity, if it is to do any good, being free, not forced; marks the disastrous effects "if the poor can count on relief as on a right" ("De la Richesse," liv. vii. ch. ii. ad fin.); and makes a lengthened attack on both compulsory and official charity (Ibid., ch. iv.). Mgr. Dupanloup says ("La Charité Chrét.," p. 21, 3rd ed.): "I know many people think Providence should be replaced by the State. For my part, I do not think so. I do not deny that the State ought to come to the aid of private charity in a great distress; but, as a general thesis, I do not believe that the State has to occupy itself with being provident for every one; I do not know if it could do so, but I am sure that it ought not." De Champagny, the Catholic historian, says ("La Charité Chrét.," p. 40), after citations from the Fathers:—"Almsgiving then is a debt, but a debt of charity, not of justice; a debt whose fulfilment should be voluntary, and therefore meritorious . . . it is not a legal debt which the public authority can support with its commands." Dr. Stöckl, a champion of Catholic philosophy in Germany, says ("Lehrbuch der Philosophie," ‡ 176) of compulsory poor-relief:—"This

* Provided the other person is not brought hereby into extreme necessity.

† Gury, "Theol. Moral.," i. n. 617; n. 228, note by Scavini (ed. 4 Ratisb.).

‡ Ferdinand Walter, the Catholic legal writer, seems to take a similar view in his "Naturrecht und Politik," § 441, saying, after noticing the evils of compulsory poor-relief, that the State and the parishes, "if they cannot quite do without a poor-rate," should reduce it to as little as possible. But

institution in itself can in no way be justified from the moral point of view. For hereby the duty of beneficence, which is a duty of charity, and thus a pure ethical duty, is turned into a duty of justice, which, as such, can and ought to be enforced, if it is not performed willingly. This is wholly to destroy the notion of beneficence, and to put in its place the cold demand of the taxgatherer." And after describing the disastrous moral effects on the poor, caused by compulsory poor-relief, he observes how this institution historically followed the suppression of charitable foundations and institutions, and has come to be considered an integral part of government. Against this notion he vigorously protests. "From the moral point of view we can never allow this institution to be looked on as being *in itself* normal and justifiable, and so forming an integral part of the political system, and resting on the essence of the State. Such a principle could only be approved by materialism, which recognizes no moral duty of beneficence, and knows only compulsory duties." In one point, indeed, we differ from Dr. Stöckl, when he thinks that compulsory poor-relief, where it exists, can be excused as a *dura necessitas*, a necessary evil, that cannot be removed, private charity being insufficient, and the old rich endowments of the poor being gone. For we cannot admit any necessity for the intolerable evils accompanying compulsory poor-relief. And to judge of what was taught in the early Church, we give the following citations from Ratzinger's history of Church poor-relief:—

Another principle of S. Paul's is also emphasized by the older Fathers, the principle of alms being *voluntary*. They know nothing of any ecclesiastical compulsion, of any poor-rate; but much rather lay equal stress upon the moral duty of giving alms and the external freedom of refusing. Indeed, the lofty view of almsgiving presupposes this freedom, without which the gift would be no sacrifice pleasing to God.*

Speaking of the period of the persecutions he says:—

Precisely because of the high importance attached to alms, the principle of their voluntary nature was maintained. None was to be compelled to give, for "God only loveth the cheerful giver." Much as the need was emphasized of sharing one's wealth with others, much as this was recommended, no command was imposed, but each might give what, and when, and how much

why, indeed, could they not do quite without it? We ought to notice that one Catholic writer, Bishop Ketteler, does actually justify compulsory poor-relief on the ground of the theological doctrine of *extrema necessitas* ("Arbeiterfrage," pp. 78, 79). But his view, we fancy, is quite exceptional, and is so shortly stated, that it may perhaps be looked on as an incidental statement rather than as a well-sustained thesis.

* "Geschichte der kirchlichen Armenpflege," p. 28.

he wished. The same Cyprian who calls the neglect of the duty of almsgiving a sin (*delictum*), zealously upholds freedom in the matter (Cypr. "de Op. et Eleem.," c. 14; "de Unitate Eccles.," c. 23). So also Tertullian. And Irenæus sees in alms being voluntary precisely an advantage of Christianity over Judaism (Tertull., "Apol.," c. 39; Irenæus, "De Hær.," iv. c. 18, 2).*

And of the Fathers in the patristic age he says:—

They only taught that property imposed duties; but they did not turn these duties into legal obligations. Rather they stood up for freedom, only recognizing a moral [*i.e.* uncompulsory] duty, though, indeed, of such importance that its fulfilment was a condition of salvation.†

And Champagny, speaking of the Fathers and their defence of private property, asks:—

Do they give at least to the Government a right over income if not over capital? Do they urge a poor-rate, vast taxes levied on the fortunes of some, in order to relieve the misery of the great mass? Not a word of the kind. Often, indeed, they speak to princes about taxation, but always to moderate it; they do not counsel them to command, but to practise charity; to give an example of it, not to make it a law.‡

The weight of Catholic authority seems, therefore, opposed to compulsory poor relief. And for the State to take by force the property of the rich in order to support the indigent, seems (were there even no other objections) an unjust encroachment upon those rights of ownership which, in other respects, are sometimes so exaggerated. Even those who would have given nothing to the poor may complain that an uncompulsory duty of charity, for the neglect of which they were answerable only to God, has been changed into a compulsory duty enforced by the strong arm of the law. And those who would have given in any case can complain almost as much as though their property had been simply confiscated. So Mgr. Dupanloup ("La Charité Chrét.," p. 31) speaks of a poor-rate as "*un socialisme légal*"; and the German economist Dr. Schäffle ("*Nationalökonomie*," § 306), speaks of the communism of the public poor-law, and of the compulsory poor-rate deeply encroaching on all private ownership. And this unjust confiscation of property can now be added to the list of objections to compulsory poor relief.

* "*Geschichte der kirchlichen Armenpflege*," p. 56.

† *Ibid.*, p. 112.

‡ "Champagny, "*La Charité Chrét.*," &c. p. 57; cf. Ozanam, "*La Civilisation au 5^e Siècle*," ii. p. 64, 65 (2nd edit.): "*A Rome l'aumône n'était un devoir pour personne, c'était un droit pour tous [that is, for all freemen, but not for the far more numerous slaves]. Le Christianisme fit tout le contraire; dans l'économie Chrétienne, l'aumône n'est un droit pour personne et est un devoir pour tout le monde.*"

We must not, however, be understood to mean that no relief should ever be given out of the public funds, and that such expenditure by the State always implies an unjust confiscation of property. On the contrary, there are certain cases when (we imagine) the State not merely may, but ought to give help; as to dangerous lunatics whose families are too poor to keep them safe, for this is demanded by the needs of public security; or again to workmen injured by changes in the arts, as by the invention of machinery, and whom, since the community gains by the improvement which ruins them, the community ought to help; or, thirdly, to those specially affected by the ravages of war or the depredations of pirates; for it is fair that districts untouched by invaders or pirates should contribute to the relief of those ravaged, on the principle of all citizens contributing equally to the expenses of war or of security. There is another class of cases where the question is not so plain, where, namely, immense and wide-spread distress has arisen from drought, or flood, or murrain, or pestilence, or, in short, from any of those accidents affecting masses and causing misery so sudden and vast that private help would be too little or too late. Few, we suppose, would object to the Government giving help in the shape of a loan to be repaid in better times; but whether more than this can rightly be done, we leave to others to discuss, only emphasizing most strongly that the admission of such help does not bring with it the admission of normal compulsory poor-relief, since there is this vast difference, that the dreadful moral evils that accompany the one are absent from the other.

But perhaps our adversaries may now say that we have been plainly ill at ease in answering the argument from the right to live; that we have been lengthy and obscure; that they will not give up their argument till something more satisfactory has been said. For them we have reserved two arguments, both short and plain. First, then, granting the right of all to relief, if starving, and the corresponding compulsory duty of all to give that relief, we say that citizens have other rights and other duties, notably the right to be protected against incentives to immorality and other vices; that compulsory poor-relief, as has been shown, is certain or nearly certain to produce the most disastrous effects upon the moral life of the lower classes; that hereby is violated the right to morality, which is higher than the right to life, and that this latter must therefore yield, and compulsory poor-relief be abandoned. In other words, we say that rather than cause the dreadful moral evils which accompany compulsory poor-relief, we should be ready to allow any amount of physical suffering and any num-

ber of deaths by starvation. Fortunately, we are not likely to have to choose between these alternatives, and this brings us to our second argument. Compulsory poor-relief is inefficient to avert deaths by starvation. "The law of the land," says Mr. Thomas Wright ("Our New Masters," p. 391), "that no member of the community shall perish from want, is practically a dead letter." Mr. Edwards ("Contemp. Rev.," Sept. 1875, p. 641) marks how "in no other civilized part of the world are so many deaths traceable to starvation as in this country," and how, according to coroners' juries, there died of starvation in England 293 persons in 1871, and 238 in 1872, exclusive of a number of deaths, probably very large, accelerated by want of food. Mr. Peek ("Our Laws and Our Poor," p. 5) notices the return for one year in the central division of Middlesex of 83 deaths, of which the cause was declared by the verdicts of coroners' juries to be "starvation."* Nor let any one venture on the frivolous answer, that it has been these poor wretches' own fault if they died, and that they need not have starved unless they liked; as though any one would choose to starve if he could escape by any course not more terrible than such a death. More plausibly it might be said that these deaths were due to the strictness of the guardians in forbidding out-door relief; and indeed there has been considerable outcry recently in the metropolitan district, that deaths by starvation have been caused by this strictness. Perhaps there is some truth in this; but we much question whether the alternative of out-door relief, with strict or even with lax administration, would do more than somewhat lessen the roll of deaths by starvation. A recipient even of the laxest out-door relief becomes a pauper; and we think that for many of the upper ranks of workmen it is a

* For those who prefer a concrete case to statistics, we give an extract from the *Times* of the 29th of last December:—"Yesterday Mr. Humphreys held an inquest at the Whittington and Cat Tavern, Church-row, Bethnal-green, as to the death of George Baker, aged 64. The deceased, who lived at 1, Suffolk-street, had been for the past few years engaged in attending horses at a water-trough in Threecolt-lane, by which he was enabled to earn about 3s. weekly. His wife earned about the same sum, and out of this they paid 2s. a week for rent. They rarely had meat, their staple articles of diet being tea and bread and butter. At length the deceased, who had been a powerful, muscular man, became reduced almost to a skeleton, and was found dead on a heap of rags in his room—which was devoid of furniture—on Christmas Eve. The evidence of Dr. Massingham showed that the deceased had suffered from long-continued privation and destitution, which accelerated his death. A verdict in accordance with the medical evidence was returned." A number of cases of deaths from starvation from 1862 to 1865 are collected in the (by no means attractive or convincing) pamphlet of Mr. Hibbs, on "Prussia and the Poor," Appendix on "The National Hecatomb to Mammon," pp. 59—81; and more recent cases (1870 and 1875—76), *Ibid.*, Appendix iii. pp. 104—106.

dishonour worse than death to become assimilated with the degraded class below them, even though not obliged to enter a workhouse. In confirmation of this view we can refer to an article in the "*Economist*" of May 3, 1862, on the distress in the manufacturing districts (through the cotton famine). The writer notices the error of arguing (as had been done) that the distress was not so great as supposed, because the applications for parochial relief had increased so slowly and to so moderate a degree; and says:—

In ordinary times, and among ordinary labourers (?), the weekly sums distributed to out-door applicants may be a very fair measure of the fluctuating amount of privation, whether that arises from deficient employment or enhanced prices of food. But this is far from being the case with the regular respectable factory hands. They are proud; they are sensitive; they are long-enduring. They abhor the bare idea of becoming paupers. They shrink from asking parish relief, both because they have always been taught to regard it as humiliating, and because it is usually doled out to them so grudgingly and so scantily. They cannot stoop to the apparent ignominy of *receiving* when they used to *pay*, and of standing side by side in the same crowd of petitioners with those who have been paupers and idlers all their lives. Hence all those among them—and these are happily the great majority—who cherish that self-respect, which is about their most honourable characteristic, will do almost anything, and bear almost anything, rather than "come upon the parish," as the phrase is. They will part with every piece of furniture and clothing that can possibly be spared before they will descend to what seems so low a depth. They prefer to exhaust every shilling they have saved, every loaf of bread and pound of bacon they can borrow from the butcher and the baker. They prefer even to beg from those who know that with them mendicity is no habit, but an exceptional and most unwilling resource. They often prefer even to starve.

And after proving the existence of distress from the statistics of mills shut up or working short time, the article continues:—

The Poor-Law Guardians may hear little of distress, and nothing of starvation, but under such circumstances we know that distress and starvation *must* exist, and be as widely spread as they are silently and bravely borne.

This inefficiency of compulsory poor-relief to avert starvation can be contrasted with the efficiency of voluntary charity. In all France, where, though the State mischievously intermeddles, as we shall see, there is no compulsory poor-relief, not half so many persons, it has been said,* die of hunger as in London alone. Long ago Chalmers urged how, if compulsory poor relief were abolished, there would be an increase not only of economy, mutual help among kindred, and charity of the rich,

* Ratzinger, *l. c.* p. 423, note.

but also of that charity of poor neighbours, that care for those still poorer, by which so much can be done.* "We cannot affirm that never in any instance would there be a remainder of want unprovided for; but we are strongly persuaded that it would fall infinitely short of the want which is now unreached and unrelieved by all the ministrations of legalized charity. . . . In those great towns of continental Europe, where the compulsory relief of poverty is unknown, we read of no such distress as should urge the adoption of such an expedient."† Let us remember that Chalmers bore witness to this failure of "legalized charity" before the "reform" of the poor-law and the introduction of the strict workhouse test; this test, then, could not have been the cause of the want being unreached and unrelieved.‡

Now at last we hope to have answered sufficiently the plausible argument in favour of compulsory poor-relief drawn from the right to life. The other arguments can be met more briefly. Mr. Mill ("Political Economy," bk. v. ch. xi. § 13) urges that, as the State must support the criminal poor while undergoing punishment, "not to do the same for the poor who have not offended is to give a premium to crime." This argument, we quite admit, has some force where there is lax prison discipline; where simple imprisonment, without the adjuncts of hard labour or corporal punishment, is a common penalty for the class of offences that could easily be committed by destitute persons; and where, at the same time, as in England,

* Chalmers, "Christian and Civic Economy of Large Towns," vol. ii. ch. x. and xiv.

† Ibid., vol. ii. pp. 66, 67.

‡ The following passage from Chalmers (Statement in regard to the pauperism of Glasgow, 1823, p. 68) shows how starvation is increased by compulsory poor-relief:—"I would have no fear of a parish anywhere in Scotland, though all claims, and all collections were done away. But I have a great fear of there being much untold and unrelieved suffering in every parish, where the public charity hath attained a magnitude that overbears the charity of nature—where it hath turned the one party into fierce and determined litigants, and put the other on a stout and stern defensive against their applications; where the imagination of a right, that most unseemly and heterogeneous element, which ought never to have been admitted into the business of human sympathy, hath set both gratification and good will at abeyance; we greatly fear that in these circumstances there is many a desolate and declining family who sink under the rigours of an artificial system which they are too delicate to brave—who, perhaps, of gentler mood, cannot brook the humiliations of a public scrutiny, and cannot fight their way through all those rude and repulsive obstacles by which the avenues of public charity are guarded. They are unnoticed by neighbours, because a refuge is open to them which they have not the hardihood to enter. The feeling of private charity is suspended, and there is a frown in public charity that scareth them away."

begging is made an offence. But where these conditions are absent, or where there is a good system of voluntary poor-relief, this temptation could hardly arise. And where the said conditions are present, the obvious course is not, as Mr. Mill thinks, to introduce compulsory poor-relief, but to reform the prison discipline, to minimize simple imprisonment, and to permit the poor to ask for help. And if we are told such reforms cannot or will not be introduced, we say that even then the evils of the aforesaid "premium to crime" are as nothing compared with those of compulsory poor-relief, which, among other things, will generate far more offences against the criminal law than would result, under the above supposed circumstances, from its absence.

To another argument urged by Mr. Mill (l. c.), that voluntary charity almost always does too much or too little, lavishing its bounty in one place, and leaving people to starve in another, it is enough to say that this would not occur where the poor had their patrimony as formerly in vast ecclesiastical endowments, and where there was organized Catholic charity, as in modern France, where the poor are served, it has been said,* by 10,000 nuns and 50,000 men and women of the laity; and that though the alleged evils *might* happen elsewhere, they would be far less than the alternative evils coming from compulsory poor-relief. And on the unlikelihood of people being left to starve even where charity is unorganized, we can refer to what has already been said, especially to that mutual relief among poor neighbours, which is so touching and effective.

Somewhat similar to the argument we have just answered is that given by Mr. Fawcett in favour of poor relief by the State.† We can resolve it into two parts: first, that relief, if left to individuals as opposed to the State, is sure to be unorganized, and therefore injurious, and that pauperism is greatest where most is given away in private charity; secondly, that almsgiving, which is thus mischievous, would be greatly stimulated by leaving all relief of the poor to private charity. As the proof of his first assertion, if we do not misinterpret him, he gives an account of some of the abuses of modern English charities; but this seems to us what the logicians would call an illicit process of the minor premiss; and he points to the fact that the pauperism of modern America and Australia has been caused by almsgiving; but this seems to us a begging of the question. His second assertion, that the abolition of compulsory poor-relief would augment private charity, we do not

* Ratzinger, l. c. p. 426.

† Fawcett, "Pauperism," p. 50, seq.; cf. p. 9.

think he proves, but also do not wish to dispute, as, if true, we should hold it to be a benefit, not an injury.

Having said enough, we think, on Mr. Fawcett's argument, let us look at one yet remaining from Mr. Mill (l. c.), that "if the poor are left to individual charity, a vast amount of mendicity is inevitable." To this we answer, that misery is the evil to be averted, not mendicity, which in times and places may be even a great benefit to society; for distress is honestly avowed, and not concealed in cellars and garrets; the rich are unable to forget the poor, and are wholesomely reminded of the realities of life, and of their own exceptional condition as to comforts and luxuries. Also mendicity may be a public profession of poverty as an honourable and not a disgraceful state, and is thus a perpetual protest against the doctrine that men are to be measured by their means, and are on earth to make money or enjoy it. We can also say to Mr. Mill that the inevitable vast mendicity is a mere unproved assertion, and that a good system of organized private charity would avert it. All we admit as logically following the abolition of compulsory poor-relief is the abolition of the legal prohibition of simple begging, that is, begging as distinct from the abuses of employing deceit or threats to extort alms, or of begging in large companies, or waiting long before private houses, or following persons long distances, and the like. Finally, we turn on Mr. Mill and say, that if mendicity is an evil, it can coexist with compulsory poor-relief, as is seen in England, where its prevalence can be witnessed by the personal experience of our readers, and by the records of the police-courts.

We have now completed the main part of our task, and have attempted to show (with what success our readers must judge) the evils inseparable from compulsory poor-relief, and irremovable by any poor-law reform; and also the untenableness of certain arguments in favour of compulsory poor-relief. Nor do we shrink from the very practical conclusion that the best poor-law reform for modern England is the abolition of the poor-law altogether, leaving the relief of the poor entirely to private charity. It would be premature to discuss the technical details of such a measure, such as the time over which it should be spread, or the future date when it should be executed, till the need of this change is more widely recognized.* It is enough for us to urge this need, and to claim the right of the ratepayers to be freed from the poor-rate, and, still more, the right of the poor to be freed from the terrible moral and mate-

* An interesting scheme of abolition is worked out by Chalmers, "*Christian and Civic Economy*," ch. xv. Whether it is the best scheme is another matter.

rial injury inflicted on them by the system of compulsory poor-relief.

There still remains the task of considering official poor-relief (*charité officielle*) as seen, for example, in France and Belgium, and distinct from the compulsory poor-relief (*charité légale*) as seen, for example, in England and Denmark, in Prussia and Sweden. The two characteristics of official poor-relief are that the funds are drawn, not from compulsory, but from voluntary contributions or existing endowments, and that they are administered by Government agents. A third feature and necessary consequence is, that the poor have no right theoretically or practically to be relieved; moreover, the funds at the disposal of the Government for the relief of the poor are strictly limited.

Now, we urge that this official poor-relief, though a lesser evil than compulsory poor-relief, is still an evil. First, it violates two of the conditions of charity; for the material gift is unaccompanied by moral reform, and those who distribute the relief are not presumably lovers of the poor. We have seen how the moral reform of the poor is one of the main parts of charity. But, as M. Périn asks (*"De la Richesse,"* ii. p. 419), "what power over the poor can be possessed by official charity, which only speaks in the name of the State, and which has not and cannot have any mission to speak in the name of God, the only authority recognized by the conscience"? And, then, what wounds are inflicted on the poor by official distributors, excellent men, perhaps, but without any vocation to the office of almoner? Where is to be found that delicacy and discernment which, without any insulting inquisition, can distinguish the true poor from the cunning and importunate? And, as with compulsory poor-relief, so here, instead of gratitude being caused, there is rather discontent at the smallness of the relief, and a keen sense that the motive of the gift is not love for the poor, but rather the political requirements of security, public order, and the removal of the unpleasant spectacle of poverty.*

* Cf. Corbière, *"Economie Sociale,"* ii. p. 426. We may be allowed a citation from the *"Journal des Economistes,"* vol. xxiii. p. 153 (anno 1849) in an article by M. L. Villermé fils, who, after noticing how private charity is exposed to weaknesses and errors through the imperfection of human nature, but that the same applies to the paid or unpaid officials that would be substituted, exclaims: "Ah! pour demander ainsi à l'Etat de faire la charité, et aux amis des pauvres de ne plus la faire, il faut n'avoir jamais vu, n'avoir jamais fait que l'aumône aveugle qu'arrache dans la rue l'importune psalmodie des mendiants; il faut n'avoir pas été témoin dans les bureaux dits de bienfaisance et dans les administrations publiques de ces réceptions glacées, de ces distributions (auxquelles manquent trop souvent les égards et les bons avis, parce qu'elles sont officielles et non inspirées par un véritable amour) que font à jour fixe d'ennuyés commis ou de formalistes délégués; il

Further, official poor-relief inflicts an injury on private poor-relief. The sums distributed by the State would otherwise, we can fairly presume, have been distributed by private charity, nor is it likely that where official poor-relief exists the private charity existing with it will be so great as if none of the field of relief was occupied by Government. But at any rate, if not the amount, at least the efficiency of private charity will be lessened by the demoralizing presence of State charity; as to which will apply, and need not be repeated, much of what has already been said (*supra*, p. 16) on the injurious effects of compulsory poor-relief. And then let it be well marked that the same notions of the fitness of substituting the State for the Church, civil for religious administration, which bring in official poor-relief, are likely to bring in also limitations to the exercise of charity except through the State. These limitations may extend from the milder measures of refusing civil personality to charitable bodies or impeding their acquisition of property to the extreme of making all poor-relief a monopoly of the State.* Lastly, official poor-relief is very likely to lead to compulsory poor-relief with its attendant evils. Compulsion is the characteristic of the works and officers of Government; if the sums to be distributed are lessened there is political danger of hungry discontent; and to supplement the voluntary subscriptions and revenues by drawing upon the proceeds of the taxes seems an easy and natural step. And the lessening (absolutely, or proportionately to needs) of the sums to be distributed is probable because of the other probabilities that official poor-relief will be accompanied by restrictions to private charity, and that such restrictions will lessen the sources of charity. The rich may lack confidence in the administration of relief by the officials, they may disapprove the particular mode of help, and some other field of charity where they would without stint have employed their wealth, is closed to them; not to speak of the unfitness of the State for the office of touching the heart and moving the generosity of the rich.† And the

faut enfin n'avoir jamais rencontré assise au chevet du malheureux, empressée, douce et patiente, la charité chrétienne, n'avoir pas calculé ses bienfaits, n'avoir entendu ni ses religieux conseils, ni ses affectueuses consolations, et avoir fermé les yeux à ses morales influences."

* See Périn, "De la Richesse," ii. pp. 417, 418.

† Cf. Corbière, "Economie Sociale," ii. pp. 455-459. The likelihood of official relief leading to compulsory, is forcibly put by Champagny, "La Charité Chrét.," pp. 381, 382: "Mettez au contraire la charité aux mains de l'Etat. Il n'a nulle puissance de persuasion, une grande puissance de coaction; il n'a pas la clef d'un seul cœur, il a celle de toutes les caisses; il ne peut rien se faire donner, il peut s'emparer de tout. Et vous voudriez qu'il n'usât pas des moyens qui lui sont propres, qu'il demandât quand il sait qu'on ne lui donnera rien, qu'il ne prit rien quand il peut tout prendre."

danger we should thus anticipate of compulsory poor-relief being introduced is confirmed by the course of history. M. Naville affirms that "almost everywhere the introduction of a poor-rate has been accompanied or preceded by that of the forms of Government management, and of the employment of civil officers in the work of distributing alms."* And M. de Gérando, no enemy of official poor-relief, says: "When the legislation of Europe became secularized, questions of poor-relief (*bienfaisance*) began to be looked at from a new point of view. It was asked if there was not also a direct though tacit engagement of society towards its members, in virtue of which it was bound to help those in distress."† So true is it that "liberation from clericalism" means enslavement by Cæsarism!

We ought here to add that official poor-relief can assume a form which changes its character by assimilating it to ecclesiastical charity. From the remarks on France in Mr. Andrew Doyle's Introduction to the Report on Foreign Poor Relief, we gather that in some of the "*bureaux de bienfaisance*" or State offices for distributing poor-relief, the actual work of inquiry and distribution is done by a large staff of Sisters of Charity.‡ Where this happens, the ill effects of State intervention are mitigated if not removed; but then in such cases we can hardly say that charity has been secularized. The poor-relief is official rather in name than in reality.

* Naville, "*De la Charité légale*," ii. pp. 105, 106.

† De Gerando, "*De la Bienfaisance Publique*," i. p. 501, cited by Périn, "*De la Richesse*," ii. p. 421. De Gerando and others confuse "society" with the "State," and because it can be said that charity is a concern of society, make it out to be a concern of Government. This is noticed by Chastel, "*Etudes Historiques sur la Charité*," 1853, p. 372, note.

‡ "*Accounts and Papers*," 1875, lkv. p. 53: "In France, investigation of cases is conducted generally by Sisters of Charity. In Boulogne there are eleven Sisters of Charity who have board and lodging, and are paid 500 francs a year each. Each of them has charge of a special quarter of the town, under the direction of a member of the commission (of the bureau de bienfaisance), their duty as visitors being strictly prescribed. They are to visit applicants at their houses, to give their counsel and sympathy to the sick, to see that all young children are vaccinated, that all those of school age attend school regularly, to report sanitary defects in the dwelling, to distribute the relief ordered by the bureau, to make up the simpler prescriptions, to distribute and to take charge of all the stores of relief in kind, and to present to each meeting of the bureau a report," much like that due from the English relieving officer to the Board of Guardians. Mr. Doyle, from personal observation at Tours and Boulogne, says of the Sisters of Charity:—"Of their devotion to the service in which they are engaged, and of the general intelligence of the *sœurs de charité*, it is impossible to speak too highly. The system of inquiry is very full, very minute, and conducted in a way that is said, and no doubt truly, to be acceptable to the poorer classes of the French people, though it would certainly be considered inquisitorial by applicants for relief in this country."

And now we may end our attack upon official poor-relief with the words of a Protestant professor at Geneva : * "*Seule la charité religieuse est vraiment profitable,*" no poor-relief unless it be religious does any real good. And thus, as we have plainly recommended the abolition of compulsory poor-relief, so also we urge that wherever official poor-relief exists, the Government should abolish it likewise, and gradually withdraw from the ill-becoming function of reliever of the poor. The late Bishop Ketteler, indeed, suggested, that as much State property (in modern Germany) was derived from the confiscated property of the Church, who had now surrendered all claim to it, a certain expiation of this robbery (which injured the poor as far as Church property was employed in their relief) would be for the State to treat it as a fund for the relief of the poor. We should say, rather, the best restitution would be the obvious one of re-endowing the Church ; and if this course is inadmissible, then the second best is to employ the funds in the ordinary expenditure of Government, with a corresponding diminution of taxation and increase of the capacity of individuals to give alms. But let not a past injustice and injury to the poor be a pretext for introducing or perpetuating a present one in the shape of Government poor-relief, with its attendant evils. In general, as to the fit action of Government as regards poor relief, we can say with M. Périn ("*De la Richesse,*" ii. p. 423) :

Let the State intervene to secure, by granting corporative rights (*l'existence civile*), the continuance of institutions founded by the free inspiration of private charity ; let it see that the conditions of the foundations, for which its co-operation is asked, have nothing repugnant to the rules of public order ; let it exercise over the administration of these foundations an inspection which may prevent abuses, and may insure the observance of the rules essential to the institution, without injuring the free action of those who have been intrusted by the pious founders with the office of representing them to the poor, and continuing the works inspired by their charity.

So there must be liberty as to the founding and working of charitable institutions, and the Government control should in the main be directed rather to help than to hinder the founder's purpose. Nor should Government, whether central or local, ever itself step into the field of poor-relief except only in certain well-defined cases, unimportant, or unusual, which we have described above.†

We have endeavoured to give in a single article a summary view of the evil of the inroad of the State into the field of poor-

* Etienne Chastel, "*Etudes Histor. sur la Charité,*" 1853, p. 378.

† See *supra*, p. 32.

relief; and our desire to leave out nothing essential to the theoretical argument must be our excuse if we have left out many interesting side questions, and have been averse to give to our argument illustration and development. And now let us say as a conclusion to the foregoing three articles on "Christian Charity and Political Economy," that we have sought to show the true theory as to the relief of the destitute, in opposition to prevailing economical and political errors. But, as in these departments of science, theory and fact must not be disjoined, we have really only given one side of the subject, and in order to complete it we should have to give an accurate account of the actual practice of past and present poor-relief. Then we should see how the Catholic Church in all ages of her long history has stood far above all other religions in the closeness in which she has stood to the ideal perfection of charity; how outside the boundaries of the Church much has been done for the poor and suffering by natural religion, by primitive tradition, and by greater or smaller fragments of revelation; how the godless State poor-relief of ancient and of modern times deserves not the name of poor-relief, much less of charity, but has been one of the worst of all the violations of man's true liberty.

ART. III.—THE LEGEND OF PROVENCE.

Monuments inédits sur l'Apostolat de Sainte Marie Madeleine en Provence, et sur les autres Apôtres de cette contrée, S. Lazare, S. Maximin, Sainte Marthe, les Saintes Maries Jacobé et Salomé, &c. &c. Par M. FAILLON. Publié par M. l'Abbé Migne. 2 Tomes. Migne, Paris. 1865.

Les Villes Mortes du Golfe de Lyon: Illiberis, Ruscino, Narbon, Agde, Maguelone, Aigues-Mortes, Arles, Les Saintes Maries. Par CHARLES LENTHERIC. Plon et Cie. Paris. 1876.

" . . Now in the fourteenth year after the Ascension the Apostles separated. And when S. Peter was about to leave the East to go to Rome, he chose out those who were to carry the Gospel to the West, whither he could not go himself, from among the elder and more faithful companions of the Saviour. And first of these was the learned Maximin, one of the seventy-two disciples, and illustrious in his gift of working miracles. S. Magdalene, who was bound by ties of charity to this disciple, determined never to leave him, wherever he might be called to go, for . . the Blessed Virgin had been

carried away to heaven and the ten apostles were scattered through the world. And there were other illustrious women and widows who had ministered to the disciples at Jerusalem, who would follow S. Magdalene out of love for her wherever she went. Among them was S. Martha, also the venerable host of Christ, and S. Marcella, her servant. Now S. Parmenas, the deacon, full of faith and the grace of God, was among the disciples, and to his care S. Martha commended herself as S. Magdalene had to Maximin the bishop. Therefore, in the company of Magdalene, the glorious Friend of God, and S. Martha her sister, the holy bishop Maximin took ship and abandoned himself to the mercy of the waves, Parmenas and the other leaders of this Christian army being with them. And so, driven by the winds, they left the coast of Asia, going down by the Tyrrhenian Sea; and leaving Italy on their right hand, they were happily driven ashore on the coast of Viennese Gaul, nigh to the city of Marseille, where the Rhone casts itself into the sea. Then, having worshipped upon the sands in thanksgiving the Lord their Creator, they divided among them, by the inner call of the Holy Ghost, the provinces of the land to which the same Spirit had called them. The bishop Maximin had Aix cast to him for his portion, and going thither, he began to sow in all hearts the seed of heavenly doctrine, giving himself up day and night to preaching the Gospel, and to fasting and prayer, that the unbelieving people might be brought to the knowledge of the true God.

Together with him, the glorious Friend of Christ gave herself up to contemplation in the church of Aix, for . . . though while still bound on earth she lived among the angels, and dwelt in spirit with the heavenly choirs, nevertheless, being full of care for the souls of men . . . she denied herself from time to time these heavenly delights to enlighten the unbelieving or to confirm those newly converted in the faith . . . and when the time drew near for her most holy soul to be delivered from the prison of this body, the Son of God, the Saviour and Redeemer of Mankind, appeared to her accompanied by troops of angels, and called her Himself to come and be partaker of His heavenly kingdom. This was on the eleventh day before the Kalends of August. The holy bishop S. Maximin had the most holy body embalmed with rich spices, and laid in a splendid tomb, over which he afterwards built a church. Upon her tomb of alabaster we see sculptured how she, in the house of Simon, obtained the pardon of her sins . . . Then S. Maximin, seeing the hour of his death also approach, gave orders for his grave to be made ready in the same basilic . . . and that his tomb should be placed next to that of the blessed Beloved of Christ, and after his death this was done. . . . The monastery is called the Abbey of S. Maximin, and is in the county (province) of Aix."

This is, in short and in substance, the account given by Rabanus Maurus, the great Archbishop of Mayence or Maintz in the ninth century, of the "Legend of Provence."* Raban Maurus embodied in his account a much older life of

* "*Rabanus de Vita Beatæ Mariæ Magdalænæ et Sororis ejus Sanctæ Marthæ.*" The manuscript of this curious life is in the Library of Magdalene College, Oxford.

S. Mary Magdalene, by an unknown author, which dates from the sixth or even the fifth century; and in this elder life, among other details, it is mentioned that after the burial of S. Mary Magdalene and S. Maximin in the crypt of the church he had built, no king, or prince, however great might be his power, dared to go to visit the shrines without leaving his arms outside, and that no woman, whatever might be her rank, ever dared to cross the threshold of the door. To this last fact we shall have occasion afterwards to refer.

There are, as we all know, traditions and traditions. There are traditions of the Church, which form a reserve, so to speak, of valuable auxiliary evidence of the truths she teaches; there are traditions of holy places, which by their universal and long-continued acclaim, appeal like that of the popular voice to personal sanctity; and there are local and national traditions, which, though chiefly possessing a local and national interest, yet form part of the treasury of Christendom, which cannot be despised or cast aside without lessening the treasure of valuable gifts; lofty feeling, sympathies and associations which the lapse of believing ages has accumulated for the behoof of the faithful. For there is no denying that the mind which opens to receive, accept, and make use of historical traditions, even when not scientifically proved, must be enriched far more than the mind which shuts up with denial and refusal.

We have been accustomed to dwell upon other than religious interests in Provence. It is the land of poetry and song, of minnie-singers, troubadours, framers of roundels in "oc" and "oui" of the too famous courts of Beauty and of Love. And until of late years, the peculiar pathos of its dying and still more of its "dead" cities, its once-flourishing bishoprics of Apt, and Agde, and the deserted, still beautiful Maguelone, have scarcely been known. And still less the wild melancholy interest of its glittering salt waters, its African flocks of ibis and flamingos, its illimitable salt marshes and reedy pools. Their desolation, as M. Lentheric truly says in the touching preface to his book,

is not without a charm of its own. I have myself spent some of happiest days of my life upon part of those forsaken shores, and it is necessary to have lived alone in the midst of those vast solitudes to appreciate the mystery and the strangeness of that sad, silent land, which seems to treasure up within itself the recollections of its own past. What these coasts may develop in the years to come I know not. They may be full of hope, but to me they will always be a land of memories.

It is of the memories of Provence that we would now

speak, and, availing ourselves of M. Faillon's learning, patience, and marvellous research into its old manuscripts and scarce historical records, we will try to get what evidence we can as to the distinctive legend of Provence.

The life incorporated by Raban Maurus in his own, is credibly supposed to be part of "The Acts of S. Maximin," drawn up in the fifth century, the rest of which were lost about 1260. The basilic built over the remains of S. Mary Magdalene, is known to have been a monastery from the very word "basilica," which was used for monastic churches in the sixth century, while cathedral and parish churches were "ecclesiæ"; and either S. Cassian himself, or the Cassianite monks founded the "Abbey" or monastery attached to the basilic, in which S. Maximin, the first Bishop of Aix, was buried. For S. Maximin is always spoken of as Pontifex, ecclesiæ Præsidents, or Antistes. His marble tomb, and the alabaster tomb of S. Mary Magdalene are still to be seen at Aix, and the Christian traveller kneeling before them, feels that the traditions of more than thirteen hundred years are enough for him, and that he is glad to accept and reverence as genuine the resting-place of two of the friends and companions of our Lord.

Honoré Bouche, the learned historian of Provence, refers the work and sculptures of these tombs to the third century; other archæologists to the fourth or fifth. But looking at the two examples from the Roman catacombs and S. Maximin's tomb given by M. Faillon, it is scarcely possible to distinguish them. Both are subdivided into panelling partially filled with wavy shell-work, having figures of exactly the same type in the central and final compartments. In the tomb of S. Maximin, the central, very remarkable subject represents our Lord conferring upon S. Maximin the gift of discipleship, and SS. Peter and Paul fill the spaces on each side. S. Maximin is vested in the *penula*, the antique garment drooping in the middle and at the sides, lifted up by the arms, which was the Greek travelling garment, and in which the statues of Mercury are usually clothed. He wears shoes, not sandals, showing that he is ready to go forth on his apostolic labours. The *penula* was common also to the ministers of the pagan sacrifices, and the whole subject cannot but be referred to the very earliest date of Christian art. It is bordered or filled up with rude figures of tritons and dolphins, such as are common in the Roman catacombs, having been in the same way borrowed from pagan altars, but used as Christian types.

The tomb of S. Magdalene is much more defaced and

mutilated, partly from the softer nature of the alabaster of which it is wrought, partly from the intense though barbarous devotion of the pilgrims, who were perpetually cutting and scraping off fragments as relics. M. Faillon gives facsimiles of it, and of the tomb of Brassus from the catacombs, with which it tallies in a remarkable degree. Both are divided into five compartments, severed by rude Corinthian capitalled pilasters, exactly similar to those adopted into Romanesque and afterwards Norman Gothic. The two central pilasters or pillars, banded, are covered with figures of pagan type gathering in the vintage. In the first of the five compartments our Lord is seized and bound; in the second He is struck in the house of Annas; in the fourth He stands before Caiaphas or Herod; in the fifth Pilate is about to wash his hands. In the central space, now almost a blank, it is supposed that there was a jewelled cross or crucifix with figures worshipping. On the two ends of the tomb are two very perfect representations of our Lord receiving the kiss of Judas, and of our Lord seated in majesty under an arcade, offering His hand to one of two soldiers in complete Roman armour. This very remarkable and unique group is supposed to symbolize the eternal peace and majesty of God the Son, and His forgiveness of His enemies.

It is the upper frieze or border of this tomb, now bare of all ornament, that bore the representation of S. Mary Magdalene in the house of Simon the Pharisee, alluded to in the older life of the Saint. Guislebert or Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster, and contemporary with S. Anselm, in the eleventh century, speaks of this sculpture in his homilies. After saying that S. Mary Magdalene had followed S. Maximin to Marseilles, he goes on "*Postea super tumulum istius una ex parte in lapide exculpi fecerit, quomodo ad pedes Domini accessit, lacrimas lavit. . . . Ex alia vero quomodo post resurrectionem procumbenti ad pedes suos, ei Dominus dixerit; 'Noli Me Tangere.'*" From that century till the sixteenth, a crowd of witnesses give the same evidence, ending with Suarez, Cornelius à Lapidè, and our own Bishop and Cardinal Fisher, of blessed memory. Like allusions to the same sculptures on this alabaster tomb are even embodied in various liturgical books of France; for instance, in the breviary of Mans, published in 1582 by Cardinal de Rambouillet, and in the liturgies drawn up for the use of Apt, Aix, and Marseilles, some of which are very beautiful and rarely to be met with. Even Dumont, the Protestant traveller and archaeologist, writing in 1699, says of S. Maximin "this crypt was built expressly for the burial of the bodies of S. Magda-

lene, S. Maximin, S. Marcella, and S. Sidonius in marble tombs, which remain to this day.*

There came a time, however, a strange, wild interregnum, when the relics were removed out of these tombs and hidden away from the knowledge of men for five hundred years.

After the invasion of Africa by the Arabian caliphs in the seventh century, when they finally broke up the Byzantine power in Africa, and expelled the Greeks, they incorporated with themselves the native idolatrous Berbers or Moors, and established one strong Saracen empire in Africa. From Africa to Spain was only a step, and in Spain the Goths had long sunk into feeble effeminacy. In 711 five thousand Saracens landed under Tarik at the great rock on the opposite coast, thenceforward known as Gebel el Tarik, or Gibraltar, and the southern part of Spain became an easy prey. But the Saracen or Moorish caliphs aspired to much more than the conquest of Spain; they had plans of a great Mohammedan empire, and they next claimed Septimania (Languedoc) as a dependence of Spain. Eudes or Odoïc, of Aquitaine, who at that time usurped, not only the authority, but also the title of king, at first held the Saracen host at bay and defeated them under the walls of Toulouse; but fresh hordes poured across the Pyrenees, and overran not only the vine-clad slopes and valleys of the Garonne and the Rhone, but ravaged the heart of France to Dijon and Sens. The whole of southern France, in fact, fell under the Mohammedan yoke. The Christian defence of Arles was obstinate and bloody; the inhabitants fortified their amphitheatre with the four towers, which remain as they were built, and it was not till thousands of dead bodies were carried down the Rhone to the sea that the city yielded, and the most perfect and beautiful model of a provincial Roman city was made a heap of blackened ruins. Abdalrahmen or Abderama stripped Lyons and Besançon, and every large town he came to, of their church plate, jewels, vestments, and relics, and then eventually set fire to the churches and left them heaps of ashes. He was only hindered from the total destruction of Christian France by Charles Martel, and he in his turn then became a destroyer; for lest the Saracens should make the fortified cities their strongholds, he himself fired Avignon, Nîmes, and other large towns, and crossing to the islet of Maguelone, one of the most distinctive of the "dead" cities of Provence, he dismantled its perfect fortifications and razed the town to the foundations.

The Saracens, therefore, were finally driven back by Charles

* "Voyage in France, 1699."

"the Hammer," across the Pyrenees, where they maintained their empire in Granada even till 1492. But the traces of their occupation are not yet obliterated in southern France, and those who know it and both divisions of the Riviera well will call to mind the interest excited by tracking out their positions and the consequences of their occupation. Even the very build of the little towns, such as Mentone, Rocca-bruna, Ventimiglia, San Remo, and others, with their bridged and arcaded passage-like streets, records that they were designedly contrived as hiding-places from the Saracen enemy. They will recall also the mountain villages, such as Grimaldi, near Mentone, into which a wheeled vehicle was never known to enter; Sant' Agnese, with its old Saracen fortress, perched like an eyrie on its own separate mountain; and Old Castellar, where the strong remains of the Saracen castle, which seem welded to the bleached crags of the Berceau, defy the attacks of storms and time. The cemetery of Mentone itself, again, was a strongly-fortified Saracen castle. The invaders left other traces of their noxious presence in the strange habits of dealing with witchcraft and wizards, which cling like a poison-plant to the Provençal people; and vestiges of their language in the many Arab words lingering in the Provençal and Riviera dialects. And long after their towns and castles had become weed-grown ruins, their galleys would swoop down upon defenceless parts of the Riviera coasts, and carry off the labouring men for slaves, and women and children for the harems.

There remain still, here and there, on some bleached limestone ridge, or in a hidden recess of some lavender-scented waste, a few of the Chapelles Expiatoires, or chantries, built either in the time of Charles Martel or the early Carolingian kings, in memory of the Christians who perished from the Saracen armies; standing memorials of the ferocious hatred of Mohammedans to the faith, and of the wreck of Christian civilization which invariably marks their destroying path. One of these is at Mont Majeur lez Arles; another, known as Notre Dame d'Aubune, is near Carpentras; and a third stands most picturesquely niched above the swift-flowing Durance, near Avignon. This last was known as "Mau-Pas," marking even a more disastrous loss than usual; but when the Carthusians built a house there, it was changed to "Bon Pas." Above the doorway may still be read these words. "*Sepultura nobilium Avenniensium qui excubuerunt in bello contra Saracenos.*"

On their first appearance in France, it had been rightly judged that their most relentless fury would be directed against

the churches and monasteries, and it is recorded that the second Porcarius, Abbot of Lerins, received a miraculous command to bury and hide the precious relics of his monastery. As soon as this fact became known, the shrines of S. Lazarus at Marseilles, S. Martha at Tarascon, S. Trophimus at Arles, the two Marys at Notre Dame de la Mer (Les Saintes Maries), and notably those at Aix or S. Maximin, where the Cassianite monks kept guard over the relics of S. Mary Magdalene and S. Maximin, were opened, and the remains taken away or buried in other hidden places. The relics of S. Mary Magdalene, with whom, as our space is limited, we shall have chiefly to do, were carefully removed from her own alabaster tomb to that of S. Sidonius, in the same crypt, where they were buried deep in the earth. The crypt itself was then filled up with sand and earth, and in that state it remained for several centuries, till the very secret of S. Mary Magdalene's relics was lost. Not long after this had been done, the Saracens poured into France; and Aix, Cimiez, Marseilles, and Arles became heaps of blackened ruins.*

There came, then, as has been said, an interregnum of several centuries, when the knowledge of the relics was lost, but when religion and devotion again flourished in southern France. And as the inhabitants, whether as Roman, Christian, Viennese Gauls, or as a separate independent kingdom of Provence, still cherished an intense devotion to the House of Bethany, it will be well to trace the devotion to S. Mary Magdalene, the Beloved of Christ, as it took different forms. The tradition of the removal and hiding of the relics had evidently been carefully preserved, and the repressed enthusiasm which smouldered as time went on and they were not discovered, at length burst out into a determination to believe that they had been carried, like the body of S. Lazarus, to Burgundy. Unfortunately the Abbey of Vezelay, in the diocese of Autun, lent itself not only to this belief, but even, so to speak, invented the relics of S. Mary Magdalene, and drew crowds of people to a shrine which did not contain them.

The Abbey of Vezelay was a very old foundation, of the ninth century in fact, for Benedictine nuns, and endowed by one of the Counts of Roussillon. Like many others, it was burnt to ashes by the Saracens before they were driven back by Charles Martel, and when it was again rebuilt on a site more capable of defence, it was made over to monks of the

* It was a singular coincidence that the Saracens and the revolutionist of 1793 both spared the Church of S. Maximin. In both instances it was used as a public building, and so preserved.

same rule, and became a very powerful and wealthy house. Unhappily then, like many other religious foundations, Vezelay, which seems to have claimed "exemption" on many points, very early fell into deplorable relaxation, and so remained till the eleventh century. About the year 1030, while so dreadful a famine raged that men killed and ate their fellow-men, and the whole length and breadth of France was full of horrors, a knight of Auvergne, who had been cruelly imprisoned by one of the neighbouring lords, invoked S. Mary Magdalene for his deliverance; and after doing so for a few days, the chains which had bound him so tightly that he could not even move in his prison, fell from his limbs and left him entirely free. Dreadful as were the crimes and passions of that time, they were underlaid by faith, and when the cruel Auvergnat lord found that his enemy had been miraculously set free, he was struck with such reverence that he gave him his liberty without ransom. The released knight immediately took his chains in his hand and made his way on foot to Vezelay, where he hung up the chains at a shrine where, as it began to be whispered, S. Mary Magdalene's relics had been found. Some relics of great sanctity must undoubtedly have come into possession of the monks, and their efficacy and the quantities of ex-votos which succeeded to the chains began to spread far and wide the rumour that S. Magdalene's body had been brought to Burgundy from Aix.

From the wide-spread rumour the steps were easy to assertion and belief, and in the year 1050, in a bull of Pope Leo IX., the monastery, hitherto known as that of Our Lady, was designated as S. Magdalene of Vezelay. A whole tissue of apocryphal legends gradually crystallized round the first unknown relics found at Vezelay, and the compact and complete legend was related of how the Abbot Eudes went from Burgundy to Provence after the Saracens had been repulsed; how he sought for the holy bodies at Arles, and found them, and transported them to the Abbey at Vezelay; all of which was a groundless fiction, but a fiction that brought a great course of pilgrims to the Abbey, and great glory to the monks. It is remarkable that in spite of the compactness of the legend, and the utter impossibility under the circumstances of proving anything against it, and notwithstanding the total dearth of facts and failure of intercourse during one of the darkest eras of French history, the Bishops of Autun discredited the existence of S. Magdalene's relics at Vezelay, discountenanced the pilgrimages, to the vehement disgust of the people, and finally went so far as to lay under interdict all who went on pilgrimage to the Abbey or prayed at the shrine as that of

S. Mary Magdalene. And although Pope Pascal II. took off the interdict as being too extreme a measure, it proved the sagacity, and what has often been called the "inspiration of office," which marked the prelates of Autun, and it no doubt caused the pilgrimages to Vezelay to dwindle and die away. But what is most noteworthy in all the complicated, and, as one might superficially say, the "disedifying" story of the Vezelay shrine, it serves in the most remarkable way to hand down and verify the facts of the coming and apostleship of S. Lazarus, S. Mary Magdalene, and S. Martha to Provence. Each fresh blossoming-out of the false legend tends to certify to the reality of the ancient stock; each flourish in the rhetorical annals of the Abbey refers to it; each brief and bull of succeeding Popes confirms the story unchanged; each chronicle, whether of Gauls or Burgundians, takes up the theme on the same original score; that after the dispersion of the Apostles, the members of the House of Bethany with some of the first Disciples of Christ, were supernaturally directed to Europe, and having traversed the Mediterranean Sea were thus brought to Gaul, where they evangelized and baptized many thousands in the true faith.

The popular voice was so strong, in spite of the more discerning wisdom of the shepherds of the sheep, that the monks of Vezelay always bore as the seal of their Abbey, our Lord appearing to S. Mary Magdalene, with the inscription, "Maria" "Rabboni." On the reverse of the seal is S. Mary Magdalene in glory, and the words "Fides Tua Salvam Fecit."

Another spot to which devotion to the Beloved of Christ has led crowds of people of all ranks and countries owes its sanctity to no fictitious legend; and while the celebrity of Vezelay waned and dwindled, and finally died away, La Sainte Baume has always been sought and revered as the grotto to which S. Mary Magdalene retired from time to time during her active ministry at Aix, and finally dwelt there for many years in the strictest penance. Many of our readers have, doubtless, visited this wild and unique sanctuary of Provence, and have carried away, besides the feelings of devotion that gladden their lives, the most vivid recollections of the singular scene—the endless climb of the ascent, the piled-up rocks of the astounding limestone wall behind the convent, the fresh fragrance distilled from pine and yew and aromatic herbs into the bright, keen air. The Baume,* or grotto, runs into the rocky curtain at the height of two or three thousand feet above the sea, and from La Sainte Baume a further rocky, precipitous path leads to the

* Balma, caverna in rupe excisa excavata.

summit of the curtain, where a tiny chapel, called *Le Saint Pilon*, is built. In the grotto a little chapel with an altar is arranged, and behind the altar is a rocky elevation, about ten feet high and wide, upon which *S. Mary Magdalene* is said to have knelt habitually when in contemplation. A very rude old image of the saint was revered there for centuries, and it was replaced by a series of others, the last of which, representing her prostrate, and holding a crucifix in her right hand, was destroyed at the general destroying of all holy things in the great French Revolution. The pilgrim visitor to this little chapel cannot fail to feel deeply impressed with the thought that in the sixth and seventh centuries, without doubt, this wild crypt, hung, as it were, in the air, was fully believed to be the scene of *S. Mary Magdalene's* penance and retreat, and has ever since been the resort of thousands of pilgrims from all parts of France, Spain, Italy, and Flanders out of devotion to her. A small congregation of *Cassianite* monks was first settled at *La Ste. Baume*, which was afterwards in charge of the *Dominicans*; and so late as 1793 there was still remaining an altar, credibly said to date from the fifth or sixth century, and to be one of those used by the first community of monks. After a time even they could not endure the incessant dripping from the rocks, and they removed to a range of cells outside the grotto. *S. Cassian* established a monastery for women in an almost inaccessible spot some way from the grotto; but it was so intensely cold, and so destitute of even the barest necessities of life, that they left the convent, still called "*Les Béguines*," and settled in a little town called *S. Zacharie-Sous-la-Baume*, where, wonderful to relate, the congregation remained, still subject to *S. Cassian's* Abbey at *Marseilles*, till 1792. In this house at *S. Zacharie* all kinds of interesting traditions were preserved of the coming of the saints of *Bethany* to *Provence*, of *S. Mary Magdalene's* retirement at intervals and final retreat to *La Ste. Baume*, and of the marvellous number of devout pilgrimages to that sanctuary, which seemed to increase instead of dwindling all through the *Middle Ages*. Among other traditions handed down, these nuns record that their community rebuilt the curious old church of *Plan d'Aups* about the ninth century or earlier, just as it remains to this day.

After the general retreat of the *Saracen Arabs* from *Provence*, and when religion again began to flourish in *Southern France*, a regular roll was kept at *La Ste. Baume* of the noted or devout persons who visited the grotto, which ran through nearly a thousand years. As early as 816 *Pope Stephen II.*, who went to *France* to crown *Louis le Débonnaire*, and *Pope*

John VIII., in 878, visited La Ste. Baume, and were inscribed on the roll. The last pope was magnificently entertained on his way back to Italy by Boson, the reigning king of Provence. In the chronicles of the Chartreuse of Mont Rieux, about twelve miles from La Ste. Baume, it is noted that in the year 1117 a rich Italian noble, who was dangerously ill, had himself carried all the way to the grotto to ask S. Magdalene's intercession, vowing that if he recovered he would build a Carthusian monastery near the grotto. He was suddenly and completely restored to health, and in fulfilment of his vow built that same monastery at Mont Rieux (ruissaux), so called from the countless mountain torrents springing from ledge to ledge of the wild limestone crags. After a while he took the habit himself, and died there after many years a Carthusian monk.

The early crusaders, many of whom took the cross on account of its plenary indulgence and remission of all canonical penance, cherished an intense devotion to S. Mary Magdalene as the pattern and mistress of penitents. There is a beautiful story told by Bishop Hugo of Rouen of one of these crusaders, a Norman named Adjutor, who in a furious fray with the Saracens near Antioch in the twelfth century, vowed to S. Mary Magdalene to give up to her his own castle, and to build a chapel in her honour, if he were able to vanquish the infidels. He was completely victorious ; but having put off for one or another reason the fulfilment of his vow for eighteen years, he was taken captive by the Saracens, who treated him most cruelly to force him to renounce the faith, and join arms with them. In these straits he continually invoked S. Mary Magdalene, and by the testimony of a long list of crusading knights, whose names are preserved, Adjutor was miraculously borne away by her into France, where he immediately asked for the religious habit, and built the chapel which he had so long vowed. His whole life hereafter was one act of severe penance, framed upon the traditional pattern of that led by S. Magdalene when at La Ste. Baume. His food, at long intervals, was the scantiest portion of bread and water, a fragment of rock was his bed and almost his perpetual dwelling-place, his clothing hair-cloth and the roughest woollen ; and after years of almost continual prayer, contemplation, and tears for his sins, Adjutor died in 1132. He was very early canonized, and throughout the diocese of Rouen and other parts of Normandy was widely invoked as S. Ajoutre or Ustre.

At Jerusalem a convent of S. Mary Magdalene was built early during the crusades for the accommodation of the many ladies who accompanied their fathers or husbands to the holy

city, in which at least a hundred sisters under her title lived in community, cooked and provided for the pilgrim ladies, and ministered to them also by spiritual aid. It is a noteworthy fact that the invocation of S. Mary Magdalene was commonly used against the Saracens, and immediately after their expulsion from Sicily the Norman Count Roger I. built a church under her title outside Messina, and at Palermo a chapel under the same dedication, called the Chapel-royal of S. Mary Magdalene, was built as a royal burial-place. When this chapel was pulled down in 1188 to enlarge the cathedral many bodies of royal and ducal persons were exhumed and buried again within the cathedral walls.

The long list of crusaders who visited La Ste. Baume is fitly closed with the great name of S. Louis, whose departure from Aigues-Mortes and passage down the Grau du Roi lend such undying interest to those desolate shores. Coming home from his first crusade in 1254, the holy king and his faithful companion, the Sire de Joinville, went from Hyères to La Ste. Baume on purpose to venerate the scene of S. Mary Magdalene's retreat, which De Joinville, as usual, recorded in the quaintest words:—

Après ces chouses, le roi se partit d'Yères et s'en vint en la cité d'Aix en Prouvence, pour l'onneur de la benoite Magdalaine qui gisoit à une petite journée près, et fumes au lieu de la Basme, en une roche moult haut, là on l'en disoit que la Sainte Magdalaine avoit vesque en hermitage longue espace de temps.

It is observable that in this year of 1254 De Joinville, who carefully relates every little circumstance that occurs, does not say that they saw the body of the saint at Aix, as he certainly would have done had it been found, but only enlarges on the visit to the grotto, which was, during the concealment of the relics, the most venerated spot for those who desired to pay her honour, and where, in consequence, the devotion of the faithful found its chief outlet.

Not much more than twenty years after this visit of S. Louis to La Ste. Baume, his nephew, Charles of Salerno, afterwards King of Sicily and Count of Ravenna, who had from his childhood cherished the greatest devotion to S. Mary Magdalene, resolved to make a far more thorough and painstaking search for the relics at Aix than had yet been possible. Although his uncle, S. Louis, had gone to Vezelay, and assisted at a last great ceremony held there by the monks in honour of relics, which they declared to be genuine, of S. Mary Magdalene, there had sprung up great doubts, and a kind of innate recognition of unreality about Vezelay altogether which is

very striking. And at the same time men's eyes began wistfully to turn with more hope towards Aix, where the Saint, when on earth, had so faithfully and lovingly ministered, as if she herself were stirring them up to the search before the time was come. Accordingly, in the year 1279, Prince Charles gathered about him some of the best and most learned men, canonists and others, that Europe could furnish, and made a pilgrimage across that well-known plain where the walls and towers of Aix first rise upon the view. The first thing they did was thoroughly to open and empty the church of S. Maximin, for, as has been said, the crypt had been completely filled with earth and sand, with the hope of preventing the desecration of the tombs by the Saracens, and when it had been partly cleared deeper excavations were begun. After the workmen had dug to a considerable depth, and nothing had been found, Prince Charles threw off his mantle, seized a pickaxe, and laboured so enthusiastically that, as the chronicle says, he was all in a bath of heat. While he was still toiling in this way some of the men struck upon some hard substance which shivered, and immediately the most delicious fragrance seemed to steal and spread through the vault, which filled the group of pilgrims with a kind of ecstatic joy. The Prince had the earth shovelled carefully away, and a marble tomb, that, in fact, of S. Sidonius, was uncovered, from which the fragrance then exhaled "as of a thousand most costly and delicious perfumes mingled," and bones and remains wrapped in thick stuffs were distinctly seen. The Prince, and all with him, were then convinced that they had succeeded in their quest, and that the relics of S. Mary Magdalene were found.

But although Prince Charles could scarcely contain his joy and delight, he knew that the utmost prudence was necessary in all the steps to be taken. He had the tomb, therefore, immediately closed up, sealing it with his own signet, and otherwise took measures for securing its entire safety from intermeddling till he could call together the neighbouring bishops and decide with them what ought to be done. Among those who came to Aix at the Prince's call were Bernard de Languisel, the Archbishop of Arles, and Grimeric de Vicedominis, the Archbishop of Aix himself, whose testimony in the matter has been of the utmost value.

In company with the Archbishops Prince Charles again descended into the crypt of S. Maximin, broke the seals of the tomb, and fully examined the remains. A body was then found entire, with the exception of the lower jaw, with even a piece of flesh and skin upon the frontal bones, which was afterwards known as the "*Noli Me Tangere*." With the coverings

and ligatures which were about the body was an old piece of cork bark, crumbling with age, which fell to pieces in Prince Charles's hands, and disclosed a morsel of parchment about the size of a man's palm, with an inscription upon it, made out with the utmost difficulty, which literally translated runs as follows:—

In the year of the Birth of our Lord 710, the sixth day of December, in the reign of Eudes (Odoinus or Odoicus) the very good King of the French, at the time of the ravages of the treacherous people, the Saracens, this body of the very dear and holy S. Mary Magdalene, out of fear of the said treacherous people, has been secretly translated during the night from her alabaster tomb to this one which is of marble, since here it is more hidden, and from which the body of S. Sidonius has been withdrawn.

This discovery was made in the December of 1279, and in May, 1280, Prince Charles called a much larger assemblage of bishops from all parts of France, learned monks from many famous monasteries, nobles, knights, and men of note and learning, who filled the streets of Aix, and crowded into and about the old church of S. Maximin. There, surrounded by troops of soldiers, processions bearing banners, standards, and lighted torches, and a dense crowd of people,* Prince Charles broke the seals of the marble tomb, and the bishops brought forth the relics and wrapped them reverently in costly stuffs of silk and gold with the utmost care, and lifted them up to the veneration of the kneeling people.† Next they were carried forth of the church, amid the enthusiastic cries and shouts of the delighted population, and with ringing of bells and the sound of chanted hymns and music the relics were carried round the square and cloisters with great solemnity, and finally deposited in a rich shrine, built expressly for this occasion by Prince Charles, wrought in gold and silver-work, and encrusted with jewels.

Above this shrine was an ark, or casket, still more richly adorned with jewels and gold-work, which received the head of the Beloved of Christ. The church of S. Maximin was then formally made over by Charles to a convent of Dominican friars, to whom also he gave charge of the precious relics; and, according to the narrator of this account, countless pilgrims for centuries after sought the shrine thenceforth with all manner of diseases and maladies, and went away cured and whole.‡

* "Cum multitudine gentium copiosa."

† It was on this second opening of the tomb and more perfect examination that a ball or globe of wax was found among the relics containing a short inscription, "Here rests the body of S. Magdalene."

‡ "Muratorii Rerum Italicarum Scriptores," tom. iii.

Not this one only, but a cloud of witnesses repeat, with slight variation, this narrative of the finding and "translation" of S. Mary Magdalene's relics in this year 1280, when Nicholas III. occupied the Holy See. Bartolomeo, Tolomeo, or by corruption Ptolomeo di Lucca, who studied under S. Thomas of Aquin at Rome, mentions it in his "Ecclesiastical History" almost exactly in the same words, though more curtly, as the account given above. He also mentions the shrine and the inner casket, "*pulcherrima theca, ex argento et auro, ac lapidibus pretiosis contexta*," in which the head only was placed * above the shrine. Bernard de la Guionie, or de Gui, a Dominican bishop and writer, who lived early in the fourteenth century, went himself to Aix and read the inscriptions found with the relics, and gives a full account of them and his visit in his "*Chronique des Papes et des Empereurs*," which is in manuscript in the Royal Library in Paris, and in his "*Miroir Sanctoral*," which he dedicated to one of the Avignon Popes, John XXII. There is also the very valuable, though tiresome and pompous testimony of Cardinal Philip de Cabassole, the Chancellor of Queen Joanna in 1355, whose manuscript, "*Libellus Hystorialis Mariæ Beattissimæ Magdalenæ*," is also in the Royal Library at Paris. According to the mediæval theory that the Saracen Arabs had so called themselves, assuming to be the children of Abraham and Sarah, whereas they were the offspring of the patriarch and Agar, Cardinal de Cabassole calls them indiscriminately "*Agarenes*" and "*Ismaelites*"; and, beginning with their ravages in France, tells the whole story at great length. He also speaks of S. Mary Magdalene generally, without otherwise naming her, by the beautiful and touching title of the most blessed "*Lover*," or most sacred "*Beloved*," which shows how deeply rooted and universal was the personal veneration of the anointer of the Body of Christ in Provence. He gives, moreover, with minute detail, the incidents of the second breaking of the seals, when "the bishops, in full pontificals,

* The head was enshrined in a gold and silver casket of the same shape, with a crown of the most precious gems. It had two movable masks, one of crystal and one of gold, underneath which the bones of the head could be seen. On the forehead was the singular preservation, as big as a coin, (*testos*) or a bean, according to others, of a piece of undried flesh with the natural skin, which was called the "*Noli Me Tangere*," "from the idea that our Lord touched S. Mary Magdalene with His hand when He used those words, and that the flesh in consequence did not decay. The arm-bones were enclosed in a silver arm, jewelled, and in a very ancient glass cylindrical vessel, called "*La Sainte Ampoule*," were a number of pebbles and sand upon which some drops of the Precious Blood were supposed to have fallen, and to have been brought by the Family of Bethany from Jerusalem.

with fear and trembling, handled the most holy body: lo! among the sacred relics was found a globe of wax, containing a short inscription in these words: 'Here resteth the body of the most blessed Magdalene.' And they were all filled with joy, as well as the people who ran together." He concludes with these words: "Verum ut pateat universis, corpus sacratissimæ Dilectricis esse in monasterio beatissimi Maximini, adducitur in testimonium series infra scripta, plena auctoritatibus, miraculis et exemplis."

Cardinal de Cabassole learnt the full details of what was commonly known as the "invention" or "translation" of S. Mary Magdalene from Robert of Sicily, the son and successor of Charles II. (then Prince of Salerno), to whom his father had often related them. A very curious little office, full of quaint poetry, was drawn up, under proper sanction, for the use of the churches at Aix on the fifth of May, the Feast of the Invention, the manuscript of which is preserved in the archives of the Bouches du Rhone. It is full of allusions:—

AD MAGNIFICAT.

An. Exultet Ecclesia
 Tam præclaro sidere,
 Virtutum ornata;
Beata Provincia,
Magdalene muncere
Felici dotata,
 Vere digne gloriatur,
 Quæ thesauro super auro
 Nobili ditatur. Alleluia.

IN NOCTURNO.

An. Stella Maris fulget in æthero
Magdalena surgit de pulvere;
 Gaudet orbis de tanto munere. Alleluia.

An. Carolus Provinciæ
 Princeps et corona,
 Alumnus clementiæ,
 Flos Patriæ,
 Meruit hæc dona. Alleluia! Alleluia!

An. Gemma nitet pretiosa,
 Virtus exit radiosa,
 Mariæ de tumultu;
 Salus datur copiosa
 Magdalene, velut rosa
 Corpus fragrat sæculo. Alleluia! Alleluia!
 Dimissa sunt ei peccata multa.

And again:—

R. *Sacrum corpus balsamum*

Transcendit odore.

* * *

O Christo dulcis et cara,

Iter rectum nobis para,

Apud regem gloriæ ;

Ubi fons est veniæ,

Et nos tibi famulantes

Semper exaudi clamantes. Alleluia !

Lastly, we should not omit to mention the six bulls of Pope Boniface VIII., two of them given from Anagni, the scene of the stormiest records of his life, in which he declares that the body of S. Mary Magdalene rests in the convent of S. Maximin at Aix, and that Charles, the King of Sicily, found and restored it to the veneration of the faithful. M. Faillon gives a facsimile of a portion of the first bull, with its curious old seals, which was given at the Lateran. The details of all these bulls relate to various matters connected with S. Mary Magdalene's relics, the establishment of convents of Brothers Preachers (Dominicans) to guard them, both at S. Maximin and La Ste. Baume, and of the indulgences to be gained by visiting that grotto and the shrine.

The immediate consequences of these six bulls are very curious, and throw a marked light upon the circumstances which, while luminous with faith, were full also of storm. The Cassianite monks had no idea of being dispossessed of the treasures and holy places which they had guarded so long, and a whole series of documents to bishops, nobles, seigneurs, and others was issued by Prince Charles as Count of Provence, calling for help in preventing the Cassianite monks from intruding, and to sustain the Dominicans in their rights, as granted by the Pope's bulls. This real and earnest strife between the two bodies of monks seems to have lasted throughout the time of Charles, and peaceful possession by the Dominicans was not obtained till his son Robert had succeeded him in his various sovereignties in 1308.

Thenceforward the story of the relics progresses onward through the reigns—as independent Counts of Provence—of Robert, Joanna, and her husband Louis of Tarentum, Louis I., an Angevin prince, Marie of Blois, Louis II., Yolande, Louis III., the "Good King René," and Charles III., after whose death Louis XI., King of France, succeeded, when Provence was united, in 1481, to the French crown. The reign of Count Robert was chiefly remarkable for the quantity of cures wrought at S. Maximin and at La Ste. Baume, and

in 1319 six silver lamps were vowed before the shrine at S. Maximin. Five kings also,—Robert himself, Philip of Valois of France, Alfonso IV. of Arragon, Hugo IV. of Cyprus, and John of Luxemburg, King of Bohemia, met at the same time on pilgrimage to the old town of Aix and to La Ste. Baume; and as they were accompanied by a crowd of nobles and followers, the prior of S. Maximin must have had enough on his hands. Count Robert met the kings with due honour at Avignon, and accompanied them to both shrines.

In the reign of Joanna, whose chancellor, Cardinal de Cabasole, was the friend of Petrarch, the poet made several pilgrimages to La Ste. Baume, and on one occasion hung up in the grotto some beautiful Latin verses in honour of S. Mary Magdalene, beginning "*Dulcis Amica Dei*," which were copied and preserved, as they began to fade, by one of the Dominicans of his time. Nearly all the Popes who occupied the Holy See at Avignon visited the shrine of S. Mary Magdalene, and enriched it with indulgences, and in the reign of Joanna Clement VII. visited Aix, and said Mass before the relics. There are still to be seen in the impoverished treasury of the church two antique papal rings with precious stones, probably left as memorials of such events.

Louis II. (1400) was unfortunate abroad in his efforts to secure the kingdom of Naples, and at home, where he waged war for ten years with one of his own lords, Raymond de Turenne; and while Provence was thus divided and harassed, the convent and church of S. Maximin and the buildings at La Ste. Baume fell nearly into ruin. Pope Benedict XIII. (Peter de Luna) therefore issued a bull to the province of Aix, enjoining that all pious legacies of every kind should be subject to a fine of two hundred gold florins to be applied to the support of the convent of S. Maximin and keeping up "the grotto of La Baume, where S. Magdalene did penance."

During this reign (1404) the crypt of S. Maximin, which had crumbled and decayed with extreme age, was begun to be restored by Marshal Boucicaut Geoffroi le Maingre.* The contract, which is very full and curious, is given entire by M. Faillon from the manuscript in the library at Marseilles, "*Condictio pro parte Ecclesiæ Mariæ Magdalene in urbis San Maximiensis*." It was not, however, consecrated under this title for more than three hundred years. "In nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi et ejus Matris Mariæ virginis gloriosæ, ac beatæ Mariæ Magdalene, sub cujus honore et titulo et

* In the reign of Charles VI. "*Bien Aimé*," of France, whose daughter Katherine married our Henry V.

vereratione subscripta ecclesia est fuit et fundata feliciter. Amen."

The document goes on to say that on one Saturday in August, about the hour of prime, the "*spectabilis et magnificus et potens dominus dominus*," Jean le Maingre, &c. &c., out of his own munificent mind, &c. &c., gave large alms for the rebuilding and enlarging the church of the blessed Magdalene; and near the high altar where the said Saint while living in this world received the Holy Eucharist, had ordered to be built a shrine of stone and cement upon four columns or pilasters; and the most minute directions follow to the "*lapicidan*," Master Calhé, as to the vaulting, coping, arcading, and windows of the church. There was to be "*unam parapiet*" round it, and one thousand gold queen-florins were to be paid for the work when done.

Almost the first act of Good King René, associated in the popular mind only with fiddlers and troubadours, was to apply to the Pope for assistance towards finishing and repairing the sanctuaries of S. Maximin, "where the body of S. Magdalene rests," and La Ste. Baume. The Pope, then Eugene IV., issued a bull from Florence, where the Council was sitting, on S. Mary Magdalene's day, 1435, granting the jubilee indulgence and for the hour of death to every inhabitant of Aix, Arles, and Embrun who should give of their substance for this purpose, either paying for fifteen or twenty days' labour, or, for a poorer class, labouring at the repairs with their own hands. René himself gave the monks a tax on all the salt under the *gabelle* of Toulon, "out of reverence for S. Mary Magdalene, whose very holy body rests in the convent of the Brothers Preachers at S. Maximin," and to beg her intercession for the pardon of his sins; also out of the "singular, true, and hearty devotion he had for the spot of La Ste. Baume, where, by God's help, he had spent nine days in prayer" (a novena during Lent). And here, again, we are met by one of those anomalies, or contradictions, which startle us in history, to the scandal of the superficial, and the deep consolation of those who believe that where there is the foundation of the true faith scattered grains of gold lie hidden among all heaps of rubbish. This is, that we find one of the foremost and most generous contributors to the restoration of the shrines of S. Mary Magdalene to be the Dauphin of France, whose fits of piety in his after-life as Louis XI. alternated so repulsively with cruelty and craft, but whose gifts and pilgrimage to La Ste. Baume seem to have been reckoned at the time to have been most generous and sincere. He caused the altar to be covered in with a handsome cupola to shelter it from the

drippage of the rocks, which was raised on pillars with black pedestals, and had running round it a balustrade of white marble. He also endowed S. Maximin with a sum of money in perpetuity, out of "sa grant singulier parfaite et entière devocion à la très glorieuse Marie Magdeleine, le corps de laquelle gist en l'église Saint Maximin de la Balme" (so distinguished, as in Provence, by the princes of France).

Very strange and quaint sketches abound in these chronicles of the temper of the times; and we learn that in this reign the Marseillais, sorely enraged at having lost the relics of S. Lazarus (carried for safety from the Saracens to Autun in Burgundy), conspired to seize the head of S. Mary Magdalene during the time of the great pilgrimages in July, and carry it off to Marseilles. There exists, therefore, an old edict of the king permitting all the people of S. Maximin to carry arms and keep guard before the relics on the twenty-second of July; and as there might not be enough men in the town for the purpose, a reinforcement of soldiers, gentlemen, and shopkeepers went every year from Arles till 1596 to take their turn at guarding S. Magdalene's shrine. In 1448 a vague rumour sprang up, probably on account of the threats of the Marseillais, that the head of S. Magdalene only was left at Aix, and that the body had been stolen. Accordingly the syndics and city officials of Aix petitioned King René that the coffer might be opened, which was done with some pomp in presence of the prior, Adhemar Fidelis, in the following year. Then the prior and his community, with all the magistracy of Aix and a great concourse of people, gathered to witness the event, when the parchment autograph acts were taken out of the coffer, read aloud to the assembly, and copies of them taken on the spot. But as it was feared lest the witness of their own townspeople only might not be thought sufficiently trustworthy, the prior and chief magistrate took the documents to the legate at Avignon, who was then Cardinal Peter de Foix, Bishop of Albano, called the "Good Legate." He examined first the act of Charles of Salerno, to which hung seventeen great waxen seals—of the king, the prelates of Aix, Apt, Sisteron, Carpentras, Frejus, and Vince, and the ten abbots present; secondly, the account of the two inscriptions sealed with four great seals of green and white wax. The legate then recorded his verification of the documents by his notary; and two other public official acts were issued by his orders, which are preserved in the archives of S. Maximin.

In 1473 René went on a visit of devotion to Aix with his second queen, Jeanne de Laval, when he gave four lamps

to burn day and night before the relics of S. Mary Magdalene. A very curious old triptych is still to be seen in the church of Saint Sauveur at Aix, commemorating probably this visit, or, at all events, the king's devotion. It represents the burning bush, with our Lady and the infant Jesus in the midst, and Moses, an angel, and the flock of Jethro below. On the wings of the triptych René and Jeanne are painted kneeling, with their patron saints in the background. Immediately behind René stands S. Mary Magdalene with the alabaster vase in her hand. A little later on René published his intention in a very beautiful declaration, too long to quote, of establishing a college of twenty-five Dominican friars, and three doctors of theology, philosophy, and canon law, out of his great veneration for the "illustrious Apostle" S. Mary Magdalene, who had preached the truths of the Christian faith to the people of France. Pope Sixtus IV. confirmed the foundation of this college by a bull, in which he alludes to S. Maximin as the place where the body of S. Mary Magdalene drew together crowds of devout persons. Just before his death, after expressing, very much like our own S. Edward, his great joy and consolation in the near completion of S. Maximin's church, which had been beautifully restored, good King René left by will six thousand florins to end the work, and very soon afterwards went to his rest.

His nephew, Charles III., lived only one year; but during that time he consolidated the college founded by his uncle, and, out of his desire to commemorate his own devotion to S. Mary Magdalene, he had a curious gold coin struck for the use of Provence, called *Magdaluces*, *Magdalons*, or *Florin Magdalons*. This coin had on one side S. Mary Magdalene holding the "Sainte Ampoule," and on the other a double cross (the special symbol of the Angevin house), a fleur-de-lys and other emblems, with the inscription "*Per Hoc Signo Vinces.*" The Magdalon florins were probably struck on occasion of the wars of Charles with the Duke of Lorraine. In his last will he leaves a legacy of two of his ships, named the *Magdalene* and *Marthe*, which adds another touch of colour to the popular devotion of the Provençals towards the saints of Bethany.

After the union of Provence with the French crown under Louis XI. very little change is observable in the documents and feeling towards S. Maximin and La Ste. Baume; but, unhappily, the honour paid to the convent, and perhaps the great influx of visitors and wealth, wrought a great relaxation of rule and life among the friars.

In 1505, in the reign of Louis XII., it is recorded that some

Italian monks, who were at the convent, stole the outer gold mask from the head and took it away with some of the relics to Italy. Louis at once appealed to the general of the Dominicans, and to Pope Julius II., who, when Cardinal della Rovere, had gone to say Mass before the relics at Aix, and the reform of the convent was immediately taken in hand. Anne of Brittany, then Queen of France, made a special pilgrimage to the shrines, and left a splendid memorial of her visit at S. Maximin, by causing the casket containing the head of the Saint to be set upon a large silver-gilt pedestal, with silver angels on each side, which added considerably to its effect. In front of the bust the queen had placed a small kneeling figure of herself, beautifully wrought in gold and enamel, and round the pedestal ran the inscription "Anne roynne de France, de France, et Duchesse de Bretagne."*

Even Francis I., that impersonation of the more obtrusive and modern French qualities,—light, fickle, rash and vain-glorious, and with a head filled to overflowing with schemes of aggrandisement and pleasure, even he, as his first act after his accession, confirmed the privileges granted to S. Maximin by Charles of Salerno, "the finder of the body of 'la glorieuse, et amye de Dieu,' S. Mary Magdalene." "And this," adds the king, "out of the full and singular devotion we have for the said saint." A month afterwards Francis confirmed, in even stronger terms, the privileges of La Ste. Baume. After the battle of Marignano, which gave him temporary possession of the duchy of Milan, Francis went to Aix with Queen Claude, the Queen-mother Louise, and his sister Margaret, afterwards Queen of Navarre, and offered the customary devotions at the shrine. The three queens, according to immemorial usage, did not descend into the crypt, but the casket and coffer containing the relics were brought into the upper church afterwards for their veneration. The king bestowed upon the convent large sums of money, and gave permission to convey wood, stone, and other materials for the church free of all duty. He also had the buildings of La Ste. Baume put in thorough repair, and rebuilt from the ground the hospice for strangers and pilgrims. He further made solemn proclamation that none of the neighbouring lords should cut wood or feed cattle in the forest of La Baume, or even enter it without leave from the friars. Probably, the rebuilding of the hospice gave a fresh impulse to the pilgrimages to the grotto during the reign of Francis, as many great personages were

* Ann had married Louis XII. after the death of Charles VIII., her first husband, and it is supposed that the double "de France" alludes to this fact.

inscribed on the list at that date, among whom was Isabella of Este, the daughter of Hercules and wife of the Duke or Marquis of Mantua, of Ferrara. Isabella made an offering of a beautiful silver image of S. Mary Magdalene, and had a Latin inscription to the saint placed at the entrance of the chapel, which was destroyed at the revolution of 1793. In 1533 Eleanor of Austria, the second queen of Francis, went to Marseilles to celebrate the marriage of the too famous Catherine de' Medici, with her son, afterwards Henry II. of France, on that occasion. He and his brother both went with her into the mountains, on a pilgrimage to La Ste. Baume, where the king joined them. Three years afterwards, the relics of S. Mary Magdalene at Aix were exposed to the greatest danger from the Emperor Charles V., who, in some of his numberless wars with France, passed the Var to besiege Marseilles. He made every effort to find the relics, which had been carried away and hidden just in time by the friars, and Charles, foiled both in his attempts on Marseilles and on the relics, both of S. Magdalene and S. Martha, recrossed the Alps with his maimed and shattered army.

Henry II., in his turn, confirmed the privileges of S. Maximin, that the religious services might be continued "*de mieulx en mieulx*," and Francis II., in his brief and sad reign, in letters dated Fontainebleau, in 1560, did the same. He was succeeded by Charles IX., of disastrous memory; who, nevertheless, began his reign by a pilgrimage to S. Maximin and La Ste. Baume. The narrative of this journey, in the quaintest French, continues the same story in all its details. "*Le roy partit d'Aix (mardi) . . . pour aller passer un fâcheux pays de rochers, et alla diner à Pourrières . . . et coucher à Saint-Maximy, belle petite ville et belle abbaye, en laquelle est ensépulturé le corps de la Sainte Madeleine. . . . Et le mercredi. . . le roy alla passer de fort haultes et fascheuses montaignes pour aller disner à la Sainte-Baume . . . qui est encrée au milieu d'un rocher fort hault, et est le lieu où la Sainte Madeleine faisoit sa pénitence.*"*

In the unhappy reign of Henry III., the ravages and wars of the Huguenots made it advisable to remove the relics of S. Mary Magdalene from Aix to La Ste. Baume; and we learn that the convent of S. Maximin was pillaged of its documents and valuables. Fearing that even the grotto of La Baume might be invaded, the king and the Parliament of Paris

* The very curious seal belonging to this document bears the youthful effigies enthroned, of Francis II. and his queen Mary, our own unfortunate Mary of Scotland, and the singular inscription FRANCISCOVS. ET. MARIA. D. G. R. R. FRANCOR. SCOT. ANGL. ET. HYBER.

ordered that a drawbridge should be made before the pilgrim's gate, which was to be kept raised and always guarded. This old edict still exists in the archives of S. Maximin.

Henry IV. did good service to the convent of S. Maximin, which had again fallen into great disorder, and he placed it and the friars of La Ste. Baume under the reformed Dominican rule, obtained by the Prior Michæelis of Languedoc. During his reign the Duke of Nevers (a Gonzaga of Mantua) went on pilgrimage to La Ste. Baume, and left a silver lamp to the grotto, which was first lit on the Purification, 1609. A marble tablet, with an inscription, was put up in commemoration, which was still to be seen in 1793.

The reign of Louis XIII. was remarkable for one of those singular outbursts of the reputed practice of unholy arts and possession which are largely recorded of Provence, and which are said to have been introduced by the Saracens from the East. Whatever may be the exact measure of truth or imagination in the matter, it is certain that numbers of credible witnesses attest the variety of facts, and that the chronicles of Provence are full of the instances given. In this case, the possessed woman, Mdle. de Pallud, and the accused, who was an ecclesiastic high in position at Marseilles, named Gaufridi, were ordered by the Parliament of Aix to go to La Ste. Baume to be exorcised, and great crowds of persons were drawn thither, partly out of curiosity and partly from zeal to honour S. Mary Magdalene's intercession in the expected deliverance of the poor lady. The exorcism as to Mdle. de Pallud was successful, and she was pardoned; but the miserable priest was first degraded and then publicly executed in the square at Aix, in 1611. In 1624, Pope Urban VIII. sent to Louis to beg a small relic of S. Mary Magdalene from the coffer at S. Maximin, and as the king had as yet no heir and as his queen, Anne of Austria, and the queen-mother, Mary de' Medici, had great confidence in S. Mary Magdalene's intercession for that end, had also begged for relics, the king wrote to the prior and sent letters patent to the Parliament of Aix, the Court of Accounts, and the magistrates of S. Maximin, to beg that the coffer might be opened before proper witnesses, and the needful relics taken out.

Once more, therefore, an assemblage of authorities gathered, first to mass at S. Maximin, and then opened the great wooden coffer, fastened with chains and two locks, and took out a bone, verified by the surgeon to be of the hand, which was broken in two for the two queens, and a finger-bone, also verified, for the Pope, which were attested and sealed up. The great coffer was then carefully re-closed, re-chained, and

sealed twice with the royal signet, on a thick white silk ribbon. Not long afterwards, when the siege of Montpellier had in part freed the south of France from the Huguenot armies, Louis XIII. made a special pilgrimage to S. Maximin to return thanks, and the next day climbed the mountains to La Ste. Baume for the same purpose, invoking S. Mary Magdalene as "the apostle of the apostles" and the protector of the Catholic faith in France. For, as the Crusaders had specially used her invocation against the Saracens, and the Catholic armies against the Albigenes, so now he asked her special aid against the Calvinists, who had eaten out the heart of so much of France.

In 1632, the Dominican general visited S. Maximin in person, and expressed his surprise and displeasure that the body of S. Mary Magdalene was still allowed to remain in a perishable wooden coffer, while the head and arm of the Saint, with the Ste. Ampoule, were in caskets of silver and gold, encrusted with gems. As soon as he had returned to Rome, therefore, he had a splendid porphyry shrine made by a celebrated Roman sculptor, who had just discovered the long-lost art of polishing porphyry. Of course, according to the also revived paganism in art at that day, this great costly vessel, which is still to be seen at S. Maximin, was shaped after an antique Roman bath, in utter violation of any fitness with the pointed architecture of the church in which it was to be placed. It stands on two great gilt bronze dogs, holding torches in their mouths, the old quaint punning symbol of the Dominicans (*Domini canes*). When it was finished, the general took it to Pope Urban VIII. to be blessed, and it was sent to S. Maximin the following year, 1635. As the ceremony of removing the relics into it, however, was a very important one, it was put off till the king could be present, and it so happened that, from one disturbance or another, this was not possible for fifteen years, and in the next reign.

In 1639 a very curious chain of circumstances evolved, in consequence of the singular theft of a portion of the relic, called the "Noli Me Tangere," or morsel of living flesh and skin from the frontal bones of S. Mary Magdalene. Prince Louis of Valois, who was then Lieutenant-General of Provence, went himself to Aix on this occasion, with a number of the most enlightened natural philosophers of the time, among them being the celebrated Gassendi. There were also three physicians, who made their report upon the state of the remains in a document still extant, signed 1640, to the effect that "they had found on the coronal bone. . . a small piece of flesh of a reddish colour, and the bone beneath it in the

same state as if it had been trepanned, which had caused the flesh to preserve the bone in its natural condition." They added unanimously that such appearances could not be attributed to any natural cause.

It was not till the very end of the reign of Louis XIII. that doubts began to be thrown upon the genuineness of the relics of Provence, and when Lannoy's book attacking them first appeared in Paris in 1644, it was condemned at Aix amid a general storm of indignation. It was perhaps on this account that the very first act of the young king, Louis XIV., was to confirm and add to every privilege of "the holy places of Provence," and crowds of pilgrims of note made offerings and additions to the shrines, especially at La Ste. Baume. Fresh lamps were hung up, new marble tablets were engraved in grateful veneration and thanksgiving for cures, and the Bishop of Senez, Duchaisne, gave a life-size marble statue of S. Mary Magdalene, by Pavillon, for the "Sainte Pénitence," which was looked upon as a chef-d'œuvre of the time. This enclosure of the Sainte Pénitence had engraved on its door, "*Adorabimus in loco ubi steterunt pedes Ejus*," alluding to the tradition that our Lord had often appeared here in a vision to S. Mary Magdalene. Over the arch was written in great gold letters, "*Locus Penitentiae*," and within it hung twenty-one silver lamps. Finally, in 1660, Louis himself, with the queen-mother, Anne of Austria, the Duke of Anjou, and a multitude of the court, with the Archbishop of Avignon, made a pilgrimage to S. Maximin, where he was met by sixty friars with their prior in rich copes, holding lighted tapers in their hands. The church was lit with more than five hundred wax-lights, and for the first time we read that the prohibition for women to descend into the crypt was withdrawn. Anne of Austria accompanied the king to venerate the relics in the crypt, and afterwards the whole company retired to the strangers' hospice, where they were served at table by the Prior and the brothers, according to the observance laid down by King René in return for his favours to the convent. The next day, after hearing mass, the king, queen-mother, and their suite went on to La Ste. Baume, leaving their carriages at Nans. The king rode on horseback as far as St. Pilon, where he dismounted, and the queen-mother was carried in a chair, which was a most wearisome business, up the rocky path, especially as it was wet and bitterly cold February weather. In spite of wet and cold, however, they remained about two hours at the grotto, and then went back to dine at Nans, where, out of devotion to S. Mary Magdalene, they ate little and entirely of meagre food. They got back to Maximin about seven in

the evening, very much fatigued, but nevertheless at once went to the church, where the archbishop and the community had everything ready for the ceremony. The ancient coffer of wood was now taken down from the high altar, and by order of the king the chains holding it were broken, the locks opened, and the relics taken out of an inner casket of copper lined with cloth of gold, within which the remains were found wrapped in linen. The archbishop reverently lifted them out, had the bones verified in the usual course by the physicians present, withdrew a fragment of one of them for the queen-mother, and wrapped them first in fresh, pure linen, and again in a rich silken scarf. This was then laid in a new casket of lead with ornaments of gold, which he had blessed for the occasion, and which was secured with two strong locks. Two broad blue ribbons were passed round this casket and sealed several times by the king with his own signet, and the casket was carried back to the crypt for the night. The next morning at nine o'clock the king and the whole assembly, with great crowds of people, every one carrying a waxen torch, accompanied the relics as they were carried processionally from the crypt to the upper church, where, amid the loud cries of joy and excited exclamations of the enthusiastic Provençals, the leaden casket was deposited in the new porphyry shrine, which had been waiting empty for it so long. This shrine also was secured to the altar by two heavy chains, and the keys of the two locks given to the king, who ordered them immediately to be broken up in his presence. The original letters patent issued by Louis immediately afterwards, fully describing the whole circumstances of the removal of the relics, were destroyed at the revolution of 1793, but the copies of them taken by the Dominicans at the time are still preserved in the archives of S. Maximin.

During the sad reign of Louis XV. the chief events with regard to the relics of S. Mary Magdalene were that the glass mask of the silver reliquary was taken off to be cleaned, when an official public examination of the portion of the frontal bones called the "*Noli Me Tangere*" took place. The chief magistrates and legal authorities, with a number of doctors, then minutely scrutinized it both in full daylight in the chapter-room of the convent, and afterwards by the strongest artificial light. All were amazed at the living appearance of the flesh and skin, and a fresh attestation was drawn up recording the appearances. During the time of the raging of the plague at Marseilles the pestilence surrounded S. Maximin, coming again and again to the gates, yet not a single person in the town suffered, which was ascribed entirely to the inter-

cession of S. Mary Magdalene. A fresh outburst of devotion to the shrine took place in consequence of this visible protection, and it was proposed to carry the relics in procession every year to record the event. But this was in the year 1721, and the rising flood of unbelief and indifference even now at the door prevented the plan from being carried out. There yet remained to Catholic France, however, the early reign of Louis XVI., and in the year 1776 the church of S. Maximin, which had been begun by Jean le Maingre in 1404, and now entirely finished for two hundred years, was solemnly consecrated by the Bishop of Nice, Monseigneur d'Astesan, who was venerated through all Provence as a saint. His presence seemed to give the people who congregated to the ceremony peculiar pleasure, and it was conducted throughout with the utmost reverence. According to the rite laid down in the Pontificale, the relics were taken out of the church for the time, and were carried, guarded by the mounted police (*cavaliers de la maréchaussée*) and a special guard of tradespeople of the town, to the great hall of the strangers' hospice, where the guards were relieved at intervals. The church, heretofore always known as S. Maximin, was now in its renovated form dedicated to S. Mary Magdalene; and it is touching to think that during all these long centuries of waiting, the name of the Beloved of Christ had been thus put aside, as it were, for that of the far lesser apostle whom in life she served. This crowning glory to the old Church of the Roman Gauls was also its last, and seemed the beginning of the end. In 1780 a fresh influx of pilgrims and of devotion drew the attention of the authorities to the state of the crystal mask of the head, through which it was scarcely possible to discern the relic, and it was taken off to be cleaned by the city authorities in presence of M. de Coriolis, the President of the Court of Accounts. It was then found that the "Noli Me Tangere" had at last separated from the frontal bone; but when the populace were begged to retire, that the cause might be properly examined by the physicians, there arose a perfect tumult of the people, and the outcry from thousands of voices, "We will not go away from the saint!" It was only by bringing up the troops, and also on M. de Coriolis promising the people that they should see the relics uncovered the next day, that they would leave the church or the square.

The next day, very early, immense crowds of people, inhabitants not only of S. Maximin and Aix, but from all the country round, filled the square and the streets, crying out enthusiastically, "Let us see the saint!" "Show us the great saint!" M. de Coriolis, fearing lest there should be

some dangerous outbreak, directed the Dominican fathers to carry the relic in procession through the cloisters, intoning the hymn "*Lauda Mater*," which was taken up by the people who followed it, full of enthusiasm, to the church. There, hour after hour, they poured in and out like succeeding waves of the sea to satisfy their devotion, till it came to nine o'clock at night, when the worn-out public officers, who had kept guard beside it the whole time, begged that the church might be closed, and that they might have time to take a little food and rest.

At the very first word, however, of clearing the church, an enormous crowd of country people, mountain-shepherds, herdsmen from miles away, pressed into it, clamorously urging their right to "stay with the saint"; and the officers found it impossible to deprive them of this opportunity of satisfying their extraordinary devotion. As if by one accord the friars again took up the reliquary, bearing it round and round the cloisters, followed by the mass of people loudly chanting, as if with one voice, "*Lauda Mater*," and holding up beads, crucifixes, rings, crosses, and the women the whole variety of their peasant-jewellery to the friars that they might be laid upon the relics. It was not till the night had nearly worn away in this manner that M. de Coriolis forcibly interposed, and insisted that the protecting mask should be replaced, and the reliquary carried back to its place above the altar in the crypt. This, which was perhaps the most extraordinary and touching public manifestation of devotion ever rendered to S. Mary Magdalene at Aix, was also the last closing scene. It was now in very truth "the edge of the storm."

One more event, striking from its manifest opportuneness, took place before that terrible storm finally burst. Louis XVI. wrote to the prior of S. Maximin, in 1781, ordering him to open the great porphyry shrine and take out a relic of S. Mary Magdalene for the Duke of Parma. This was accordingly done; then the leaden inner casket, sealed by Louis XIV., was opened, and as if by a kind of inspiration, instead of taking out any small fragment of bone, the prior took out the largest fragment that remained, sealed it up as usual in fresh linen, and took it to Parma himself to present to the Duke, whose letter of thanks to the town is still preserved. Not long afterwards all the relics that remained in the porphyry shrine were scattered to the winds, while this generous gift to the Duke was safely preserved at Parma, and in the course of events was brought back to Paris and given to the Church of the Madeleine. But, meanwhile, the terrible storm of revolution broke

upon France. The friars were driven away from S. Maximin, one aged priest, Père Sand, was left for a while at La Ste. Baume, but even he was obliged to fly after seeing the shrines pillaged and destroyed, the precious archives torn and scattered, and the hospice, and chapels, and the whole grotto a heap of ruins. At S. Maximin the lamps, jewels, sacred vessels and treasures, accumulated during so many centuries, were seized, melted down, or destroyed; the porphyry shrine was broken open, and the relics thrown away; the great silver casket and the angels were melted down. But a man named Bastide, who had been the lay sacristan of the convent, was determined not to lose any opportunity, and he took service with the constitutional priest, by which means he was able to rescue S. Mary Magdalene's head which had been thrown contemptuously out of the silver casket. Bastide huddled it up in a cloth, then carried it away to his own house, and kept it hidden there for some years. He also found and preserved the "Sainte Ampoule," and the casket in which the "Noli Me Tangere" had been sealed up after its division from the head, both of which, being reckoned as worthless, had been thrown into a corner.

Singularly enough, the preservation of the church of S. Mary Magdalene, which has excited the surprise of many travellers, was owing to a Buonaparte. Prince Lucien (as he was afterwards) was at that time keeper of the stores at S. Maximin, and he removed all his hay, straw, wine, and even gunpowder into the church, and caused "Fournitures Militaires" to be written in great letters over the door, having first displaced the altars and turned them with their fronts to the walls. In this way, whatever clamour was made for the destruction of the church, was met by the objection that it was national property and a government store. For twenty years La Ste. Baume was, as we have said, a heap of ruins, but the faithful Provençals, nevertheless, kept up their pilgrimages there, and every Whit-Monday especially, though there were neither altars, nor masses, nor priests, they spent hours in prayer, waiting and hoping for better times, for there was still salt in the grand old kingdom. They did not pray and wait in vain, for in 1814, two days after the return of Louis XVIII. to Paris, nearly thirty thousand pilgrims are said to have climbed those desolate rocks and prayed in the grotto as of old. In 1816 the feast of July was again fully celebrated, and three years afterwards the chapel was formally re-established, and in 1822 the relics, preserved so marvelously by Bastide, were carried the whole way by the townspeople of S. Maximin to the grotto, where the Archbishop of

Aix solemnly blessed the immense concourse of pilgrims, reckoned at about forty thousand.

Meanwhile, the splendid church of the Madeleine, built on the spot which was first chosen for a great military monument by Napoleon I. to perpetuate his victories, was raised up as a magnificent memorial to the Beloved of Christ. Napoleon himself, in his Italian wars, seized the casket with the relic which had been sent to the Duke of Parma, and presented it to the Madeleine in Paris; and thus the "apostle of the apostles," as the French kings for long centuries had named S. Mary Magdalene the sinner, found a new apostleship in the very heart of Paris, as it was seething with misbelief and wickedness after the overthrow of religion and the unholy return to pagan orgies. Surely, then, we may now again freshly believe that her intercession will not be in vain, and may with great hope utter the cry to the Saints of Bethany, to the Beloved of Christ, to save France.

The story of the relics of one only of the Apostles of Provence has been told, and there remain the traditions of S. Lazarus, S. Martha at Tarascon, and the beautiful legends of the two Marys to narrate at some other time. For the scene of the deaths and the shrines of S. Mary Jacobé, and S. Mary Salomé is more striking and unique than any others in Provence, as the stern and solemn old church of Les Saintes Maries, uprising from the sands of the Camargue like some huge stranded and deserted ship, has a grandeur and a pathos above all others on those desolate shores.

But while loving to linger about those pathetic old cities and their memories, we must not forget to say that to us the beauty of the "*Legend of Provence*" lies in its marvellous fulfilment of the words of our Lord. From the Roman Gauls to Louis XVIII., taking the whole line of French kings; Louis XI., with his cruelty and treachery, Henry II., Charles IX., and Henry III., whose reigns were one scene of disaster from folly and vice, Louis XIV. and Louis XV., the bulk of whose courts and clergy were (to speak within bounds) not conspicuous for sanctity; all these, in spite of every visible drawback, alike joined in adding links to the golden chain which ran through the centuries of outward evil, thus handing on the story of the loving Beloved of Christ, which, wherever the Gospel was preached throughout the world, was to be told of her.

ART. IV—A BISHOP'S LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE UNDER THE NEW GERMAN EMPIRE.

Drei Jahre aus meinem Leben. By DR. CONRAD MARTIN, Bishop of
Paderborn. Mainz. 1877.

THE diocese of Paderborn is one of the largest in Germany. Its bishop, Dr. Conrad Martin, has just published a little work, which may vie with Silvio Pellico's "*Le mie Prigioni*," being an account of a three years' banishment from his see. It is not "*Poetry and Truth*," remarks the writer of this little work in his preface, "but only the truth, which is written down in these pages." And, true to his statement, the Bishop tells us in dispassionate language of his captivity, of its joys and sorrows, of the friends who were so true to him in his adversity, of the whole Catholic Church who shared his banishment in a measure, and of that most august prisoner, whose sympathy was so freely given to his suffering brethren, and whose captivity was in itself, perhaps, a pledge that they, too, must taste of his own chalice.

With the presentiment of future events, or rather of the storm which was about to break over their pastor on account of the *Culturkampf*, the people of Paderborn came in large numbers in the spring of 1874 to assure him of their love and fidelity. The demonstration began on the 25th of March, when the train deposited 5,000 pilgrims in the ancient city of Paderborn. They repaired to the Bishop's house, and terminated the meeting by simultaneously falling on their knees to recite aloud the Apostles' Creed. These deputations lasted for two months, and on one occasion the number of deputies amounted to 15,000. It is not an insignificant fact that the flock stood bravely by the pastor in his hour of need. But at last the cloud burst. Repeated infringements of the May Laws were laid to the Bishop's charge; the fine rose in proportion to a sum altogether beyond his means, and a corresponding term of imprisonment was the only alternative. Here an unknown, and consequently doubly generous benefactor interposed, and paid the money required without the Bishop's knowledge. But, to use his own simple language, Dr. Martin, "from higher views, thought he could not accept the benefit," and protested against it, whereas the local authority said that he could. At last an answer came from Berlin deciding that he should sub-

mit himself to imprisonment. As the Bishop would not consent to that, force was used, and on the 4th of August, 1874, he was taken from his palace through a dense crowd of sympathetic spectators to his prison, where he was witness of a scene, as he says, "not to be described by words." Bouquets of flowers fell at his feet from all sides, and the steps leading from the carriage to the abode of his sorrow were thick with them. Two works in particular had been near his heart as a pastor,—the foundation of establishments for the fitting education of the clergy, and the perpetual adoration of the blessed Sacrament. This touchingly-expressed devotion to himself was therefore a fruit of his own labours. If it has become widely known through the world, we must remember, too, that never before had the Bishop of Paderborn shared the prison common to malefactors of every description. The prisoner was then conducted to his two cells. One he describes as "certainly not roomy, but still not wholly unpleasant"; the second was to serve merely as a bedroom. Loneliness is the prisoner's trial, and when first the Bishop heard the lock and key turned from without remind him of his utter solitude, sad thoughts pressed themselves upon him. Many years ago he had paid a pastoral visit to this same prison, and his own encouraging words spoken then came home to him now. "Could you, then, only have imagined," he said to himself, "that you yourself should be confined in the same dungeon, and come to need the same recommendation to resignation and patience which you gave to those prisoners. Oh, what a change, what a comparison *then* and *now*; *then* when there was no *Culturkampf*, but an undisturbed and joyous peace. O tempora, O mores!" The angel of consolation was at hand. The thought of that Divine Providence, whose care of us is so beautifully specified in holy Scripture, brought peace, for "every hair of our head is numbered." The Bishop determined upon active endurance, and during those first few hours of his imprisonment planned for himself an order of duties for the coming solitary days. That night the breaking of a pane of glass in his bedroom window, caused by the throwing of a stone from an unknown hand outside, was a little alarming. In spite of inquiries on the subject, it could not be discovered whether the missile was directed by a friend to catch his attention, or by a foe, who might have taken umbrage at the demonstrations of intense affection on the part of the people of Paderborn.

For the rest the Bishop, according to his own account, had small cause for complaint during his confinement at Paderborn. His food was provided, and sent from his house. He was

allowed to read and write when and what he liked. Strict supervision was, however, exercised on his correspondence, and on the visits which he received. These were permitted in the presence of a third person only, and letters might be read and received under the same condition. The holy sacrifice, which was his daily refreshment, supplied many deficiencies in that lonely heart. But "the body of death" had still to suffer much from privation of air and exercise. It is true that once a day the prison bolt was withdrawn for an exercise of two hours in the courtyard. This had to be taken in common with the other prisoners in a very limited space, so that the Bishop often preferred to sit by an open window in his room, there to enjoy what air he could get.

On the 17th of August, the eighteenth anniversary of his episcopal consecration, the widowed cathedral of Paderborn was filled with an assembly of the Bishop's devoted children, who celebrated the occasion by heartfelt prayers for him to God. Flags adorned the houses of the Catholic inhabitants. But the pastor's heart was further gladdened by the intelligence that from the very first day of his captivity, a certain number of the faithful had gathered every evening in the *Gaukirche* to offer up the rosary for their oppressed Church. And now, after the lapse of three years, the same practice is kept up; and who would be so presumptuous as to say that the Divine Head of the whole body will not allow pleading so constant finally to bring about the desired end? It reminds us of that supplication of the infant Church to remove Peter's chains, or of a case which was brought before our personal observation in Germany.* The May laws have banished the *Pfarrer*, but a priest manages to pay an occasional visit to the spot, though he may not say mass. By some favour, or perhaps by reason of these visits, the Blessed Sacrament is still reserved, and the villagers succeed each other during the day in unremitting prayer before the altar.

Upon the Bishop's six weeks of solitary confinement followed eighteen of custody. But the only distinguishable difference between the two consisted in the non-bolting of the prison door from the exterior; and on the outset he was saddened by the command to surrender his office as bishop. The summons came to him through the Oberpräsident von Kühlwetter, whose attitude to the Bishop from the beginning of the *Culturkampf* had been most hostile. One act in particular of Dr. Martin's seems to have aroused the enmity of the non-Catholic party, but the principle of authority must fall to the ground where

* At Königstein, in Nassau.

demands wholly contrary to his conscience are waged upon a spiritual ruler. The act in question had been a certain pastoral letter in the affair of the Old Catholics. The Bishop replied immediately that "devotion to the Catholic Church had been his first love and that it would be his last." Ten days were allowed for the reconsideration of the point, under the threat of ultimate expulsion from his dignity. But, thanks to an energetic nature and the quiet peace which is the fruit of a brave determination, it had small influence over the Bishop. He laboured to finish his work on the "Christian Life," and time, which is so often the greatest trial of the prisoner, passed rapidly away. His feast-day, the 26th of November, was the next small event to break the monotony of his life. From his window he could see the festive appearance of some neighbouring houses, and from far and wide came wishes of sympathy and affection. The telegraphic messages and letters of congratulation numbered over eight hundred on this day, and proved a provision of encouragement for several succeeding ones. They were the flowers of persecution, and, as such, most particularly appreciated by the Bishop's Catholic spirit. Oppression does indeed often bring the work of the Lord to a timely and palpable development, and we may echo the prisoner's words, "Would years of hard work have given evidence of so close an union as well as this short and fleeting sorrow?" At the same time two other addresses reached him, which were a source of particular joy; the one from a good number of Belgian noblemen, who thereby called forth a remonstrance from Prince Bismarck, and the other from two imprisoned bishops of the far West, who were themselves confessors of the Faith, and protesting by their personal efforts against the evil spirit of Freemasonry. They were the Bishops of Para and Pernambuco, who, profiting by the journey of a priest to Europe, took occasion to express their love and sympathy to the fellow-sufferer in Germany, since he, like themselves, was bearing strong testimony to Catholic truth. Comfort, too, came from the Holy Father, who sent first a gold medal, and then, on the feast of S. Conrad, a telegraphic message of greeting and good wishes. But the price of these favours was suffering and still greater suffering. The threat on the part of the secular power to depose the Bishop was now carried out. Many and grievous had been his shortcomings, according to the balance established by the May Laws; and amongst the accusations brought against him was the erroneous charge that he alone of the German bishops had worked in favour of the Papal Infallibility at the Vatican Council. Extensive quotations from his pastoral letters appeared in the indictment,

whilst the words he had addressed on various occasions to his faithful children, their constant devotion to him, the legal measures recently carried out, and the cause now pending, were alleged as the ground why he could no longer continue to exercise the pastoral office. He was invited to appear on the 5th of January, 1875, to answer these charges, after which day the act of deposition was nailed to his door inside. "There it remained," remarks the Bishop, with dry German humour, "for the rest of the time of my imprisonment, without my casting one single glance upon it." In spite, however, of this painful position, the feast of Christmas, which occurred in the midst of these cares, found him not altogether joyless. The prison chapel bore for him a resemblance to the grotto of Bethlehem.

The Bishop fancied that, after enduring twenty-four weeks of custody, he might hope for fresh air and liberty. That expectation was rather too sanguine. Instead of its accomplishment, his house was stripped of its furniture (it was later sold), and he himself was conveyed, on very short notice, to Wesel. The same sympathizing crowd met him on his way to the station, and his private secretary accompanied him by choice to the new scene of his imprisonment. It was on the 20th January, 1875, that the Bishop entered on the two months' penalty at Wesel, and there, on the whole, he seems to have been better off than at Paderborn. He could walk freely on the ramparts, and enjoy, to a certain extent, social intercourse with the other prisoners, who were, in most cases, priests of his own diocese. Three cells were set apart for his use, the third, through the thoughtfulness of the commander, being reserved for the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice. The fortress was daily sanctified by the masses which were said by the different priests up to ten o'clock. Had it not been for this work of the highest merit, Wesel might be likened to the "middle place, where souls suffer for a time on account of their sins." Once, when he was taking exercise on the ramparts, which overlooked the Rhine, in itself like the face of an old friend to the Bishop, some of the faithful, who descried him from a distance, knelt for his blessing. The act, Dr. Martin knew not how, was communicated to the commander, who forbade the Bishop, in writing, to repeat it. At Wesel correspondence was free, and even newspapers of all kinds were permitted. Feelers were sent out by the Government to test the Bishop's sentiments with regard to his civil deposition, but his consent could never be obtained. And he was cheered and supported by an address which was brought to him, towards the end of March, by a nobleman, on behalf of the diocese of Paderborn. It contained

these words: "It is true that your lordship, as bishop, has been deposed by the Royal Court of Justice in Berlin; but you are and will remain our bishop, and we will be faithful to you unto death." Two thick volumes bore the signatures to this statement, and they numbered 96,000.

After his two months in the fortress, the Bishop was refreshed by a little breathing-time in a friendly house in Wesel itself, which town was assigned to him as a temporary residence. There he was treated as a confessor of the faith by persons of every rank. The love and sympathy of the people of Wesel could not have been more tender, he says, towards their own pastor than it was to him. The railway porters and mechanics, who rendered trifling services, all refused payment from him, whilst it is certainly true that in his actual state he served as a centre of attraction for demonstrations of every kind, which would not have been drawn forth towards a bishop quietly busy in his own diocese. One day, for instance, a visit was announced to him of one thousand Catholics from Bochum, and amongst the number were members of the Catholic Choral Society, who, with true German instincts, came to refresh him with some music. His host at Wesel had just married and taken his bride to Rome. On their return they brought to the exiled pastor a new token of sympathy from the Holy Father in the shape of another gold medal. The days passed pleasantly for the Bishop, as far as that was possible out of his diocese, until he made the discovery that he had not yet paid the entire penalty of his famous pastoral. "I had always thought," he writes, "that for one offence it sufficed to be punished once. But the powers of the State said no. As many times as your pastoral letter has been read in churches, so often are you punishable. Now, as there are about 600 churches in my diocese where the pastoral was read, I had become liable to be punished 600 times. And if each imprisonment lasted but one month, or even a fortnight, or a week, I should have been obliged to pass the remainder of my days in confinement, even if God were to give me a good many more years, and then without discharging my penance altogether satisfactorily." For the present he was sentenced to another month's imprisonment in the fortress. Again the universality of the Catholic Church was brought home to him in the written mind of its distant pastors and children. The Bishop of St. Francisco, who had worked with the Bishop of Paderborn, at the Vatican Council, on the *Deputatio pro fide*, now sent a Latin address, to which a number of priests and laity had put their signatures, and it reached Dr. Martin opportunely enough two days after his arrival at the fortress. Two from Catholic Austria he also

mentions, adding, "I would give them both in full, only they contain too much praise of myself."

Summer had come, and a return to the fortress in that season entailed no small amount of discomfort. The sun's penetrating rays made the prisoner's little cells almost intolerable, and the Bishop's health began visibly to decline. He lost his appetite and his sleep, and the only remedy, according to the doctor, to produce return of vital power would have been change of air and a course of sea baths. But for this desired end he learned from the Mayor of Wesel, that it would be necessary to undergo an examination from the district doctor, and to procure a written statement that such treatment was required. Moreover, it was specified that the place chosen for the cure should be at least twenty miles distant from the diocese of Paderborn. A Protestant doctor was accordingly consulted, and his opinion exactly corresponded with the Bishop's own account of his state, whereupon Dr. Martin gave himself up to the pleasant hope of soon being able to leave Wesel. "I wished for haste the more," he says, "as my state became worse from day to day. The continual agitation in which I was kept helped to aggravate things. For day after day I received tidings of new ruins which the unhappy *Culturkampf* worked in my poor diocese."

In the autumn of 1873, that is, after the promulgation of the May Laws, the Bishop had given faculties to four newly-ordained priests. This is the most natural and harmless action of a spiritual ruler, for decrepit, indeed, must be the ecclesiastical power which suffers infringement of jurisdiction. Ordaining a priest is analogous to the action of calling to the bar in the law. What if a bishop should require a barrister to present himself at the spiritual tribunal before he took a brief? But the May Laws are even thus inconsistent. The Bishop was accused of breaking Art. 15 of those regulations, which runs that "spiritual rulers are bound to present such candidates as are about to receive a spiritual office to the Oberpräsident, whilst at the same time the office is specified." If the barrister had obtained briefs after he was called, nobody ought to complain, but because the priests in question *had* exercised their faculties, Berlin thought well to condemn the Bishop to a further imprisonment of six months. But now a new phase began in the life of Dr. Martin. Having "waited and waited" for permission to follow out the cure which a dispassioned authority had pronounced absolutely necessary, he resolved to act in spite of the law, and to fly from Wesel. Not only did he consider this course allowable, but even obligatory, seeing two principal reasons. His health was seriously endangered if he

could not have the required treatment, and that health belonged not to him but to his beloved diocese. Furthermore, in Wesel his movements were so closely watched that one single act of the pastoral office might afford the Government a plea for yet more rigorous measures. Therefore on the 3rd of August he wrote an official letter stating his intended departure from Wesel on the morrow. What a curious spectacle is the flight by night of a bishop from his native land ! As the clock struck the hour of midnight he was quietly crossing the bridge over the Rhine, and on the following day, the 5th of August, he was received at the castle of Neuburg, by the Amsenburg family. How full his heart was of his appointed work we may gather from the attempt to return to Paderborn. At Aix-la-Chapelle, two railway authorities recognized him, and he was counselled by a valued friend to go back to Holland "in God's name." The document which reached him a few days later proved the soundness of the advice. It was from the Minister of the Interior at Berlin, announcing to him the fact that from henceforth he was an outlaw in the eyes of his country. The May Laws further exhausted their bitterness against him by the arrest which was issued from the District Court in Paderborn for the furtherance of another imprisonment of six months. But it seems that these punishments did not affect the Bishop's peace of mind. After his fruitless attempt to regain his flock, he had directed his efforts in the first place towards physical restoration. At the end of a three weeks' cure in Kattwyk, which worked a most beneficial change in his state, he visited the Bishops of Haarlem and Roermond, and rejoiced his spirit by witnessing some of the fruits of the new and vigorous Catholic life, which has been promoted in Holland by the re-establishment of the Hierarchy. In the Archbishop of Utrecht he found an intimate friend, for in the *Deputatio pro fide* they had sat side by side, and Dr. Martin pays a high tribute to the catholic judgment of this prelate when he says that at the Vatican Council he had scarcely seen one more prominent in the matter of papal infallibility. The Bishop of Paderborn's sincere admiration was called forth by the numerous fruits of Dr. Schaeppmann's working at Utrecht, his new cathedral and churches, the hospital and home for orphans, all splendid buildings and raised by the generous alms of Dutch Catholics. The Seminary stands at a distance of many miles from the see, which is apparently always the case in Holland, and on a beautiful autumnal day Dr. Martin was taken by the vicar-general along a road bedecked with rich villa residences to Arnheim. The Seminary offers a complete course of philosophy and theology, and numbered at that time 132 alumni ; but the Bishop's visit fell in the

autumn vacation, and in place of students he found the priests of the diocese engaged in making a retreat. A little further on, in the middle of a wood, were some German Benedictine nuns from Bonn and Eisleben. Many of them were personally known to the Bishop, and their meeting in a strange land was full of emotion. Holland is sown with exiled religious from Germany, but the Government, which suffers them to remain in peace, would not afford the same freedom to Dr. Martin. Utrecht was formerly a victim to Calvinistic demolition and the party spirit of Jansenism. As to the Jansenists, the Bishop assures us, their churches are in a state of decay, and no man in Holland troubles himself about them. After these pleasant expeditions he returned to his kind host at Schloss Neuburg and occupied his leisure time in visits to the Redemptorists at Wittem, and in writing on religious subjects, amongst which one was devotion to the Sacred Heart. The conventual library at Wittem put at the Bishop's disposition a means of enjoyment which he had not known since his exile. Three books only had accompanied him from his episcopal house, the *Summa* of St. Thomas, the Moral Theology of St. Alphonsus, and his Breviary; and the getting a new supply from his own library was impossible. In fact his books had shared the fate of the rest of his furniture, and been seized by the Government. He mentions with great pleasure a visit to the Sacred Heart Convent, at Blumenthal, where, as in the dear Vaterland, the Feast of the Immaculate Conception was kept as a holiday of obligation. These peaceful days, however, were not of long duration. They were shortened by one of the bitterest experiences which a pastor can be called upon to endure—that is—an unfaithful friend. A priest of his diocese (the only one besides Mönnikes, he remarks) had gone over to the enemies of the Church, and vainly had the Bishop tried the power of loving exhortations. He was obliged at last to use that spiritual weapon, which has ever been obnoxious to a world impatient of restraint, and to pronounce excommunication, fully conscious of the possible consequences of the step, and, therefore, prepared to accept them. The excommunicated priest had delivered the act into the hands of the secular authorities, and now, four weeks after the spiritual sentence had been passed (March 14, 1876), the Dutch Government, incited by Prince Bismarck, peremptorily demanded the Bishop's departure. "I prayed to God for light," he says; "I asked St. Joseph (whose month it was) to lead me where I should go." His steps were directed to Catholic Belgium; but it also proved too weak to protect an exile. Whatever the Belgian people may be, the policy of its Government is rightly defined by the Bishop in these words, which apply

likewise to Holland: "In these small countries the height of all the wisdom of statesmen is to keep clear of Prince Bismarck's complications." He was not, therefore, so much astonished when he received orders to leave the Belgian frontier.

A homeless, houseless wanderer, the Bishop once more wandered forth in strict incognito, we are not told where, but the place must have been wisely chosen, for there he remained in great retirement from April, 1876, till the following April. Then it was that Rome, the home of all Catholic hearts, again awoke his desires. Owing, however, to the well-known sentiments of the Italian Government, he was aware that the journey had its dangers for a bishop under the ban of the *Culturkampf*. He set out, nevertheless, and on his journey through France, experienced numberless consolations, and the warmest reception from the French bishops. Persecution helps the Church in these times, as it did in the days of the catacombs, to realize before the world the device, *cor unum et anima una*. But Dr. Martin views religion and piety in France with great penetration, for whilst enlarging upon the fruits of its Catholic spirit, he speaks with an apostle's zealous sadness of those places where the spiritual life is all but extinguished. He signalizes in this respect the villages and towns in the neighbourhood of Paris. At St. Denis, by the side of the exquisite abbey where France buried her kings, he found Sunday desecrated, empty churches, and no frequentation of the Sacraments, "even amongst women." Children confessed before their first communion, and many not again till marriage, and till later the Holy Viaticum almost necessitated the step for decorum's sake. "My astonishment," says the Bishop, "over the outward magnificence of the cathedral was not greater than my affliction over this desecration of the inner temple." What I had heard and read of this decay was far surpassed by the reality." Again at Le Mans, which, as the native city of St. Liberius, patron of Paderborn, had special interest for Dr. Martin, he notices the same extremes of good and evil, with the consoling fact to counterbalance the latter, that ultra-liberal parents surrender the education of their sons to the Jesuits. The vigorous and Catholic training of the rising generation make us hopeful that the saying quoted by the Bishop may soon have run out its course; "for the greater towns of France there would seem to be no purgatory, only heaven and hell."

It was on the 4th of May, 1877, the Feast of St. Monica, that he arrived in Rome for the fifth time. Men are trying to make even the eternal city new, and as the Bishop walked through the familiar streets, he felt that the voice might

indeed be Jacob's, whilst the hands were Esau's. The Colosseum, consecrated by memories so heart-stirring, now struck him as the face of a dearly-loved friend, whence the spirit had fled. It is the nature of Rome to be the most conservative of cities, and never are natural laws overturned with comfort. These were the German Bishop's thoughts, as again he compared what had been to what was, the more so as he discovered the improvement to be wholly material and exterior. If he found new streets in course of erection, he could not shut his eyes to that which so often, if not always, accompanies progress when it is not based upon religion,—the diminution of morality. Even the faces of the men he met seemed to have altered; for, he says, they are mostly not Romans, but a kind of heterogeneous mob gathered from all quarters of the globe. But what is most serious, the outward element of evil which is brought to bear upon Rome will end by corrupting the good within, and what is to prevent the outburst of revolution in its very worst sense? The present Italian Government, like the German, has muzzled the sheep-dog, and who is to raise the cry of alarm? Catholic energies are stifled in the Eternal City; leeches are applied to suck the patient's blood, for blood is the life, and the Church cannot exist as a pure soul. If in France we may still find comfort in the thought of the Catholic education of youth, in Italy we have no such counterpoise to our sorrow. Since the fall of the Temporal Power, Rome numbers fourteen Protestant churches, with as many schools, where the propaganda of Protestantism and unbelief is active. English, Germans, and Americans, who nourish hatred of Catholicism as the first article of their creed, if, indeed, hatred of anything may hold that place, spend much labour and gold to cause children to be taught in these schools, where religion is at zero.

"Remember March, the Ides of March remember."* When the Emperor William lately experienced the first barbarous attack upon his life in that fatal Unter den Linden, he made the significant remark to his ministers, "We must do all we possibly can to preserve religion amongst the people."†

Assuredly, if May Laws be allowed to suck all the juice out of Catholicism, it will one day be a case of *incidit in foveam quam fecit*.

When Pius VII. returned to Rome, after undergoing the tyranny which had threatened to annihilate his action as

* Julius Cæsar.

† "Man soll alles aufbieten, damit dem Volke die Religion nicht verloren gehe."

Sovereign Pontiff, he invited his enemy's family to partake of hospitality in that city as the land of great misfortunes, but now the Holy Father, his successor, could offer nothing but an affectionate greeting to a bishop who had borne so noble a witness to the truth. The shadow of Pius IX.'s captivity fell upon all his children. An exiled bishop seeks refuge in Rome, as the home of his father, and Rome cannot give him what he seeks. By the advice of several cardinals, Dr. Martin changed his residence and went out only in secular dress, but not before he had been denounced by unfriendly papers as one who was under the ban of arrest. On the 24th of May, in consequence of continued persecution from the press, and in honest fear of more serious ill-treatment, and strengthened by the loving farewell and the Apostolical Blessing of the Holy Father, the Bishop of Paderborn directed his steps to an unknown place of exile, happy at least in his resemblance to One who, coming unto His own, was not received by them.

The early Church wrote the acts of her martyrs that the remembrance of their deeds should never perish, and the Church of the nineteenth century may be allowed to record the struggle of her confessors not only for a perpetual memorial of them, but also that others who are not in the fight may realize at once the presence of the battle-field and the nature of the warfare. We have seen that it exists : its nature cannot be better defined than by the words of him whose confessorship we are recording.

"The Papacy is in fact the one and only point round which the *Culturkampf* is raging, and I am convinced that, if the 'deposed' and banished bishops were to break off their connexion with the Holy See to-day, to-morrow they would be re-established in all their honours and privileges. On the 3rd of August last it was three years since I parted from my beloved flock. After God, that flock is daily my first and last thought. My prayers, my anxieties, my studies, and my occupations of whatever nature belong to it. I will be true to it till death, and I hope by God's grace that it, too, will be true to me. Hours of temptation come upon me sometimes, it is true, hours when the horrible doubt suggests itself, whether I shall ever return to it. But I take courage to myself again through a trusting look up to God. He has counted every hair of our heads, and if my return is in accordance with His holy will, no *Culturkampf* will have power to prevent it. But should it be His good pleasure that I close my eyes to this world separated from my flock, I say with most humble resignation : may His Will be done.

"But even supposing all we 'deposed' and exiled bishops

should die in banishment, the Church, and the Church in our German Fatherland, will finally conquer. He, to Whom all power in heaven and on earth is given, is her protector. And let her enemies be as numerous and powerful as it is possible to be, an hour will come when of them also it will be said: 'They who sought after her life are dead.'"

ART. V.—CATHOLIC COLLEGE DISCIPLINE.

Catholic Systems of School Discipline. By Hon. and Rev. W. PETRE.
London: Burns & Oates.

WE considered in our last number the religious and disciplinary aspect of Catholic College education in England, reserving for a future article the hardly less important question of intellectual training. We proposed to postpone treating that part of the subject, until Mr. Petre should have concluded his own exposition thereof; and then to avail ourselves of the very valuable materials which he is sure to supply. The course which that gentleman has now (we think very wisely) adopted, will have the incidental effect of deferring the article which we projected to a somewhat later period than that at which it would have otherwise appeared. He intends to conclude his whole treatment of moral and disciplinary education, before he proceeds to that of intellectual; and we postpone accordingly our own remarks on the latter subject, until we shall have Mr. Petre's before us.

In reading the present pamphlet, as in reading those which have preceded it, we find ourselves very largely concurrent with the author's general principles; and we think he is doing service of extreme value, in pressing the practical application of those principles on a large number of Catholics, who theoretically accept them. But we are more anxious on this very account, that so good a work be not impeded by exaggerations or errors; and the review of Stonyhurst discipline, to which the present pamphlet is mainly devoted, is in our view vitiated (we must plainly say) by one or two very serious mistakes of principle. He makes it indeed abundantly plain, that he has no personal feeling against the Society of Jesus, and that he does fullest justice to the admirable qualities of its members. He observes e.g. (p. 13), that the work of those Stonyhurst officials who are called "masters" "is for the most part done with an energy almost saintly"; though he thinks that that work is very injudiciously laid out for them. He quotes the testimony of another writer, that in those masters "there is often to be found an earnestness and intensity of purpose, and a desire to give help to

their students, which is not met with in the same degree elsewhere." He mentions (p. 24) that no Stonyhurst boy can fail to feel respect for the Prefects, because these "are single-minded and most conscientious men." And the following passage is as honourable to himself as to those whom it commemorates:

For eighteen months I was a student of theology in St. Beuno's, North Wales, by a special privilege never to be forgotten, which placed me, a single secular, among some fifty Jesuits. Throughout that time I was treated with a delicacy of kindness which no words can exaggerate. Throughout that time I lived in daily increasing admiration and wonder at the purity of intention, singleness of purpose, utter self-forgetfulness, almost transcendent piety, which I there beheld. Throughout that time, though my intercourse was unrestricted with all, I heard not one word of unkindness pass between man and man. The work we were called upon to do was hard beyond the endurance of one less mortified than them. But even though so it was, I clung to the kind faces, the cheerful intercourse, the childlike heartiness which ever surrounded me (p. 43).

It is not then of any personal feeling against the Jesuits, that we can suspect Mr. Petre for a moment. Moreover, as we have already said, we intensely sympathize with most of his fundamental principles. We heartily agree with him, that college superiors should be chosen with a most special view to their capability of dealing with the juvenile mind; that they should carefully study any given youth's character, in the training (whether moral or intellectual) which they impart to him; that (in Bishop Hedley's words) "education means growing, coming out, developing, and not repression or keeping down"; that genuine education "fosters rather than represses," and "encourages the exuberance of nature, while it does not omit to prune and to guide." But we do think that in his zeal for these (perhaps not always sufficiently remembered) truths, Mr. Petre very injuriously under-estimates the absolute necessity of certain repressive and supervisory rules, which are universal in Catholic colleges, and which we must maintain to be absolutely indispensable for securely training a body of youths in habits of Christian morality. Our full meaning will be made clearer as we proceed. We are referring of course not exclusively to Mr. Petre's express statements, but to the impression which his words and tone will produce as to his meaning. We may add that—his pamphlet having appeared so close on the end of the quarter—we shall here attempt no more than to give a general sketch of what we would say; leaving it for our Catholic readers to fill up the outline, by thinking out the various particulars which we shall indicate.

We are speaking, be it observed, of disciplinary usages, which are universal in Catholic colleges, and are no peculiarities whatever,

whether of Jesuit, Benedictine, or secular.* Those to which objection is taken, whether by Mr. Petre or by some recent "Tablet" correspondents, have their foundation (as we pointed out at p. 330 of our last number) in the special value attached by all Catholic superiors to the unspeakably precious virtue of *purity*. And if, in what we are going to urge, we are obliged to touch on matters which it is very distressing to handle publicly, we must plainly say that it is Mr. Petre who has compelled us so to act. He has put forth in effect a severe criticism of various disciplinary habits, which Catholic superiors regard as in some sense sacred. We on our part are entirely on the defensive; nor is it possible in the nature of things that we can otherwise repel his assault, than by indicating clearly what are the sacred and vital interests, in behalf of which such habits are essential. And we would thus introduce what we have to say.

In no other respect, perhaps, have Catholics more plainly and unmistakably shown that it is they and not Protestants who are the true "Bible Christians," than in the keen appreciation which their practical religious system has always shown, as to the unique and priceless value of that virtue to which we are now referring. Most unmistakable as is the New Testament teaching on this head,—it is Catholic authorities, and not those professing the Bible as their one rule of faith, who have been so diligent and indefatigable in devising safeguards for the secure preservation of this virtue. In particular, and as bearing on our present theme, it is Catholic educationists who have (beyond all others) made such preservation the one central purpose of school discipline. In prosecuting this purpose, they have been taught by experience the absolute necessity of certain fundamental disciplinary principles. These are carried out, no doubt, under different Catholic systems, with great difference of application and detail, and in some instances (it is probable) far more wisely and judiciously than in others; but the principles remain substantially identical. It is these great principles, we say, which all Catholic schools agree in most tenaciously retaining, while in this or that Protestant public school they have been contravened to the extremest extent possible. We will give a few illustrations of our meaning; and that we may not be suspected of inventing imaginary and practically impossible contingencies, we will take our illustrations from what has actually as a matter of fact occurred, under systems deficient in (what we account) due disciplinary supervision.

* We do not forget that the author (p. 43, note) distinguishes Stonyhurst to its disadvantage from other English Catholic colleges. But we think that, as a matter of fact though not in his own intention, both the argument and the rhetoric of his pamphlet, on the matters which we proceed to mention in the text, militate against the received usage of all Catholic colleges without exception.

Mr. Petre, in the pamphlet preceding this (p. 40, note), quotes a very significant sentence from a Protestant writer; and he himself italicises it, in order to fix on it his readers' attention. "The dark sides of English boarding-school life," says the writer, "are well known to me." There are certain "dark sides," then, of Protestant public-school life, to which Mr. Petre himself attaches much importance, but of which (for whatever reason) he does not in words explain the precise character. It will be observed, moreover, that the Protestant writer speaks exclusively of "boarding-schools," as distinct from "day-schools," of which the alumni sleep under the parental roof. Such a statement points emphatically to the necessity of some system or other (in every boarding-school) of supervision, which shall ensure regularity of nocturnal discipline. Catholic colleges accordingly, without exception, provide, in one shape or other, for such supervision; and Stonyhurst has of course its own arrangement for the purpose. Mr. Petre describes this (p. 34) in a tone, which will (we think) give every reader to understand that he accounts it in some way objectionable. To our mind nothing can possibly be better than the Stonyhurst plan. It is far more comfortable of course for any given boy on any given occasion, that he should sleep all night undisturbed, as boys ordinarily do; but if he does unluckily awake, surely it is pleasanter for him—nay, will give him greater chance of getting off to sleep again—if he sees the Prefect by his side, and exchanges a few kindly words with him. We should think any ordinary youth would considerably prefer this to finding himself left alone among a body of sleeping companions. And Mr. Petre does not attempt to explain how, except by some such system of nocturnal supervision, the "dark sides of English boarding-school life" are to be prevented from overspreading Catholic colleges also. In this, as in other matters, it is Catholics who are true children of the light.

We will take a second illustration, from a personal reminiscence of Protestant public-school life. At the school where the present writer was educated, a somewhat remarkable habit prevailed in his time (i.e., some fifty years and odd ago), at one particular portion of the year. The boys assembled round the fire, shouting various songs in chorus at the top of their voice, with perhaps doubtful musical result, but with most indubitable heartiness. Several of these songs abounded in the most impure details imaginable; expressing them in language, than which none coarser and more direct could by possibility be used. If any individual boy disliked them—we suppose there must have been some who did so, though we never happened to fall in with the phenomenon—he was however necessitated to hear them, for there was no other room to which he could possibly retreat. We are quite confident—we are bound to say it in all candour—that the masters and tutors had no suspicion of what these songs contained;

but as non-supervision was an essential principle of the school, how were they to know anything about the matter? * And the fact we have mentioned will of course indicate the further fact, how amazingly and (to look back at the past with one's present notions) how bewilderingly unveiled was the whole course of ordinary conversation. † Now we are not for a moment implying, that all this represents the normal state of Protestant public schools, nay nor even of the particular school at which it took place. We have no doubt whatever, that there is very considerable mutual difference between the social condition, whether of different schools, or of the same school at different times. But on the other hand we are equally confident that, wherever supervision is away, there is a constant *tendency* in this evil direction, though at certain times and places the tendency may by accidental circumstances be more or less restrained and repressed. Even if at some particular period there be very considerable improvement, the advent of one or two thoroughly ill-disposed boys—supposing them to be of that type which carries influence with it in large schools ‡—may at any time suffice to bring forth the ancient evil in its full completeness. We are convinced that, at various Protestant public schools at various times, boys who have come thither with innocent and uncorrupted minds,—in thousand thousands of cases really without any fault whatever of their own,—receive a knowledge of evil which (once acquired) can never be effaced, and a stain on their imagination which (once impressed) can never be wiped out. To a good Catholic parent, the notion of such a fate befalling his son would be a cause of piercing anguish indeed. And the Catholic superior will consider no pains excessive, which may avert so fearful a calamity. §

* While we are correcting the press, we happen to open the "Examiner" of July 13. That journal refers, as quite a matter of course (p. 879), to the fact, that "our English boys" are not "subjected to the Continental system of espionage," i.e. supervision, "in the playground as well as in the schoolroom."

† Mr. Petre thinks that English boys are signally superior to those of another nation on this matter of purity. See e.g. p. 43. It may be as well, therefore, to mention, that there was not a single foreigner in the school (and at the time) to which we refer.

‡ See our remarks in April, p. 353.

§ In the controversy concerning education which was carried on among Catholics in the years 1860 and 1861, the two prominent advocates of the Protestant public-school system signed themselves respectively "X. Y. Z." and "Derlax." Of these, the former professed no more as "certain" in behalf of the moral character of these institutions, than "that it is *quite possible* for a boy to pass through one of them unscathed," and that "*some* actually do." The latter said, "It is unhappily too true that the sacred virtue of purity is little prized and seldom pursued by the majority of Protestant boys and youths," inside a public school or out of it.

Neither of these writers of course implied for a moment, that he would

Now Mr. Petre's remarks in p. 43—which we shall quote a few pages further on—imply, as far as we can see, that no “system of supervision which is merely external” can produce any important result, in arrest of the devastating plague which we have just described. We must account this opinion—whether it be Mr. Petre's or no—a serious and deplorable mistake. We quite admit that no school discipline will be at all permanently satisfactory, which does not include moral influence as well as external supervision. But though external supervision cannot by itself do everything, it can effect a great deal of very valuable and important result. Certainly we believe that the evils which we have just described cannot be averted with entire security and success, except by such methods as those on which we laid stress in our last number. Let superiors be chosen with most special reference to their power influencing boys; let them pass their time as living and integral members of the school, in most intimate companionship with every other portion; let one most principal, most prominent, most unintermitting purpose of all concerned in education be the practical diffusion (by conversation and intimate personal influence) of a true Christian spirit throughout the community; let the character of each student be carefully studied; if the character of any given boy be not entirely satisfactory under this particular head, let him not be allowed to converse with other boys except under supervision; let every use of improper language be promptly put down with peremptory severity of punishment. But even if such recommendations as these be not all of them carefully carried out—still (we confidently maintain) the mere recognized existence and active exercise of disciplinary supervision will be found of immense advantage. If it is true, as Mr. Petre thinks, that in some colleges the supervisor exhibits the aspect of a “warder” rather than a “companion”—we deeply lament the fact; but we must still maintain, that it is quite immeasurably better for him to be present among the boys as “warder,” than not to be present among them at all. Supervision, exercised by itself and without the energetic accompaniment of moral influence, will probably fail of being sufficiently ubiquitous entirely to restrain evil conversations. Granted. But still it will do vast service, by driving them (as one may say) into an obscure corner; by invoking on them public reprobation from the sounder part of the community; by saving a vast number

be otherwise than deeply shocked at the notion of such habits existing in a Catholic college. Their theory was, that the Catholic Sacraments would suffice to avert those evils, without the accompaniment of stricter moral and disciplinary supervision than is commonly exercised in Protestant public schools. The present writer at the time argued earnestly against this theory, which to him has ever seemed one of the most extraordinary ever started.

of unsuspecting and innocent boys from contaminating influence.* This is one great truth which Mr. Petre's pamphlet seems to disparage. Because mere disciplinary supervision is very far from being all that may be desired, his words seem to imply that it will be of no service at all. We speak of his "words" and his "pamphlet" rather than of his personal opinion, because we are not disposed to believe that his expressions do him justice.

And let this also be carefully borne in mind. A system of external supervision is one which may far more be depended on than any other, as permanent and unvarying. The degree of moral influence, which at any given time may be exercised by superiors, is ever on the ebb or flow; depending as it does on a hundred different circumstances, which are especially liable to change. On the other hand, disciplinary rules have an eminently conservative character; they continue from year to year by a kind of mechanical routine; they depend comparatively little on the particular character and competence of existing superiors; their very existence bears loud testimony to certain holy principles; and lastly, they secure an indefinitely firmer platform than would otherwise exist, on which the exercise of moral influence may be established.

It is quite an invaluable rule, therefore, which prevails in all Catholic colleges—or rather an absolutely indispensable one to their existence as places of really Christian education—that a chosen number of supervisors be constantly and (if you will) "officially" present among the body of students, for the purpose (among other purposes) of peremptorily putting down all evil conversation. We heartily admitted indeed last April, that in various ways supervision may be pressed too minutely; that "it would be a deplorable arrangement, if young men were kept under jealous and minute surveillance up to the very moment of leaving school, and were then thrown suddenly adrift on the wilderness of the world" (pp. 333, 4); that "it is plain at once how much injury is done to the character of youths, when they find themselves unreasonably and unjustly mistrusted" (p. 335). But we also protested against the notion "that we regard the evils of this distrustful and (so to speak) police system as ever so remotely comparable in gravity, with those of the extremely opposite system; as ever so remotely comparable with the truly horrible results, which must ensue in the long run from the habit of non-supervision" (pp. 334, 5).

Our immediately preceding remarks refer to a fact, which

* We venture to think that even "carpet slippers" (see our April number, p. 330) may be very beneficially used, where there is question of detecting those unprincipled profligates who ruin souls by corrupt conversation. We assume it of course to be well known in the school, that such methods *will* be resorted to.

needs to be practically provided for in all schools with extremest wariness; the fact of some corruptly-minded youths finding their way into a community, and then (after the manner of their kind) taking every possible opportunity to disseminate the poison with which they are charged. But disciplinary supervision has another work to fulfil, apart from this fact altogether; viz., the protecting innocent youths from falling into this or that position, which—thanks to the Devil's ingenious and persistent malice—may be to them a suggestion and an occasion of sin. For obvious reasons we cannot enlarge on this, but readers of Mr. Petre's pamphlet will observe one or two passages to which our present remark is relevant. We may remind our readers of what we said on the matter in our last number, p. 333 note. We would also, however, refer to what we said in p. 335. The end to be carefully aimed at is, that on the one hand a youth be anxiously protected against the evils to which we refer, while on the other hand as little as possible be said or done which may make them an object of his thought.

Another source of fearful evil in Protestant schools, over and above that which we just now mentioned, is (as we can personally testify) the impure details contained in many of the heathen classics. On this evil the Church has not only spoken by her acts, but in very explicit words. There has of late been much discussion among Catholics, as to the religious advantage or disadvantage of classical education; and the Holy See has spoken not unfrequently on the subject. We doubt if there be so much as one instance, in which the permission to study classics has not been accompanied by some earnest enunciation, on the duty of expunging therefrom every licentious image or thought. Here is another and an exceedingly important branch of disciplinary supervision. Mr. Petre (as far as we can judge) seems to feel towards it but scant sympathy. "All novels were strictly prohibited" at Stonyhurst, he says, "*and books were mercilessly expurgated*" (p. 20). Perhaps, however, the word "mercilessly" is a misprint for "mercifully." Let us by all means hope so. Which of the two schoolmasters shows an animus of greater "mercy"? He who would save youths from what may imperil their salvation? or he who would rather save them from the momentary disappointment, which may be inflicted by their finding that there is some passage, more or less bordering on the impure, which they cannot amuse themselves by reading?

We can thoroughly understand indeed there being difference of opinion among various excellent priests, as regards the extent to which expurgation of literature may advisably be carried; especially in the case of students who are being educated for the world. But we fail to see in Mr. Petre any hearty sympathy with the *principle* of expurgation; any thorough sense of the fearful evils which may ensue from its absence; or any appreciation of the admirable motives, which

sometimes perhaps lead pious superiors to make practical mistakes in the degree of expurgation they exercise.*

To sum up then. Mr. Petre—if we rightly understand the bearing of his remarks—in our view consistently underestimates the importance, as regards chastity, of certain disciplinary supervisory habits, which are universal in Catholic schools. And he gives a reason for his judgment. "I do not believe," he says (p. 43), "that the majority of boys are evil or corrupt. . . . Where there is corruption it is most frequently individual, interior, and not to be remedied or retarded by any system of supervision which is merely external." But it is really difficult to understand him as expressing by these words any affirmation, which on the one hand is relevant, while on the other hand he can possibly intend it. He cannot possibly doubt (1) that such a propagandism of impurity as we have described may be powerfully checked and thwarted, even by a supervision which is purely external; nor (2) that if it be *not* so checked and thwarted, the school's moral atmosphere will become appallingly corrupt and poisonous; nor yet (3) that there is required in a youth something which may be called a miracle of grace, and something which may be called an heroic effort of free will, if he is to preserve purity amidst a circumambient impure moral atmosphere. We are tempted to doubt whether Mr. Petre can have carefully laid to heart what Catholic theologians lay down, on the quite exceptional awfulness of these particular sins; the quite exceptional proneness of human nature towards their commission, at least as regards *thought*; and the obligation, quite exceptional in its degree, of fleeing from whatever may be an occasion of them. We are confident that at one time or another there has been many a Protestant school, in which—according to Catholic theology—the alumni were strictly bound under mortal sin to make their escape from the school if they could possibly do so. What we have been saying is, that even a supervision which is merely external can at least save a school from falling into anything which approaches this degraded and detestable condition.

"The majority of boys," says Mr. Petre, are not "evil or corrupt." Most certainly not, when they move in a regulated and orderly way, from being under the supervision of Catholic domestic life, to being under the supervision of a Catholic college. But how about Protestant public-school boys? It is Mr. Petre himself who lays it down as "indisputable," that "in morality Catholic schools

* We must not be understood to admit for a moment that the Stonyhurst authorities do "make practical mistakes in the degree of expurgation which they exercise." We have no knowledge whatever on the subject. But for more reasons than one we have thought it far more satisfactory, to content ourselves in our present article with a discussion of certain general principles

are infinitely superior to non-Catholic schools" ("Position," p. 30). In our last number (p. 331, note) we drew out part of what is contained in this statement. These were our words: "Catholic schools, for which he only claims that they 'have a *fair* measure of success in the conservation of innocence,' are, nevertheless, according to Mr. Petre's estimate, 'in morality *infinitely* superior to non-Catholic schools'; and this is a fact so clear and obvious, as to be 'indisputable.' These non-Catholic schools then are 'infinitely' removed from having achieved even 'a *fair* measure of success in the conservation of innocence.' So much as this is certainly included in such a statement—as no one (we suppose) will deny—viz., that an indefinitely large portion of the older alumni are sunk in mortal sin, without making any attempt to extricate themselves therefrom."*

We should add a further explanation, lest the meaning of our present article be misunderstood. In a most interesting and able paper which Mr. Petre contributes to our present number, he takes up a general position with which we are disposed entirely to concur. He maintains (1) that where a school is comparatively small, in proportion to its smallness the need of fixed methodical supervision becomes much less, and moral influence tends to be more sufficient for the necessary purposes of Christian education. Then (2) Mr. Petre maintains, that this circumstance tends signally to improve the quality of the moral education given. Our own bias, as we stated in April (p. 352), is earnestly to concur with Mr. Petre's preference of small schools over large ones.

As we have already said, the pamphlet before us came out so late in the quarter, that we must be content for the present with these brief remarks, all-insufficient as they are on so grave and large a theme. After all that we have said both in this and our preceding number, no one will think that—because we are compelled to differ from Mr. Petre on one (certainly very important) class of questions—we are at all insensible to the many truly admirable qualities displayed in what he has written, or to the very great benefit which the discussion originated by him is sure to confer on the Church. And we will conclude by placing before our readers a very interesting extract from Charles Butler's "Reminis-

* Mr. Petre in his present pamphlet (p. 16) repeats his admission, that "in morality Catholic schools are infinitely superior to non-Catholic schools": adding, however, that "morality" is here to be "understood as synonymous with chastity, not with moral development." Yet in his previous pamphlet he had distinctly stated (p. 25) that, whereas in Catholic schools "boys must live by the motive of love of God daily and hourly inculcated"—in Protestant public schools "they must be content to adjust their conduct by what is honourable, manly, gentlemanly." Surely, then, in general moral development Protestant public-school boys must be as conspicuously inferior to Catholic boys, as in the particular virtue of chastity.

cences," which has been shown us by a friend ; deferring, however, all comment on it to some future occasion.

"From Hammersmith the Reminiscent was removed to an English Catholic college in the University of Douay, under the care of secular priests. This was one of the seminaries of education, which, as education at home was denied them, the piety of Roman Catholics formed on the Continent. The principal of these were that at Douay, and one at St. Omer's under the direction of the Society of Jesus—'stirps ad promovendas bonas literas feliciter nata'—as Lipsius said of the Medici. The design of all these institutions was to educate, for the ecclesiastical state, a succession of youths who might afterwards be sent on the English mission. The Catholic gentry availed themselves of them for the education of their children. They were excellently instructed in their religion ; the classics were well taught ; but the main object of them [these seminaries] being to form members for the Church, they were not calculated to qualify the scholars, either for business, the learned professions, or the higher sciences of life. Writing, arithmetic, and geography were little regarded in them ; modern history was scarcely mentioned, and little attention paid to manners.

"But every care was taken to form the infant mind to religion and virtue: the boys were secluded from the world ; everything that could inflame their imagination or passions was kept at a distance ; piety, somewhat of the ascetic nature, was inculcated ; and the hopes and fears which Christianity presents were incessantly held in their view. No classic author was put into their hands, from which every passage describing scenes of love or gallantry, or tending, even in the remotest degree, to inspire them, had not been obliterated. How this was done may be seen by any person who will inspect Father Juvenci's excellent edition of Horace or Juvenal. Few works of English writers were permitted to be read ; none which had not been similarly expurgated. The consequence was, that a foreign college was the abode of innocence, learning, and piety.

"It has been questioned whether this system of education is perfectly free from objection ; whether the sudden transition from the walls of this holy retirement into the allurements of pleasure, which every youth must encounter the instant he steps into the world, is not likely to make him rush into the opposite extreme of indulgence and dissipation ; whether the strict state of coercion in which these students were educated did not tend to break their spirit ; whether their imaginations were not too much subdued by the awful view of the eternal years thus incessantly presented to them ; whether more of the world's morality ought not to be taught to all who are to live in the world ; in one word, whether the general effect of the system was not calculated to produce a feebleness of mind and soul, that would shrink from contention, and give the palm to the less religious but bolder adventurer,

"'Vincentem strepitus, et natum rebus agendis.'

"'But—what is the end of our being ?' asked a priest, to whom, for the sake of obtaining his answer, the Reminiscent retailed these objections

'Is it, what is usually termed, to succeed in life? to deserve the praise of elegance? to obtain renown? Is it not to save one's soul? Can this be done better than by protracting innocence as long as possible? What can compensate its early loss? You say that all this purity will shrink at the first touch of the world. Be it so; but the victim will then only be in the situation in which he would, in all probability, have been much sooner, if he had been educated in a dissipated school. Besides, is it certain that this will be the case? Does experience show that the habits of years are so soon overcome? Admit, however, that it unfortunately happens, who is most likely to experience salutary compunction? and, when sober years, the '*retour de l'âge*,' as the French describe this period of life, shall come on, who is most likely to return to religion and regularity—he, whose youthful years were strict and pious, or he, to whose youth devotion was unknown? You say that this sequestered education and these submission habits disqualify for active life: but don't they teach obedience, teach modesty, teach duty? Now, what is the rank, what the pursuit, for which these do not eminently qualify? But, let experience decide the question. The exclusion of the Catholics of this realm from all public, and from most lucrative, situations, and the general depression of their body, place them under many disadvantages. Making due allowances for this circumstance, and for the comparative proportion of their numbers you will find that they will not suffer in comparison with their Protestant brethren. No, the more I think of it,' continued the good ecclesiastic, 'the more I feel disposed to advocate the strict precautionary discipline of our foreign colleges.' The Reminiscent sincerely rejoices that he was educated in one of them. The words, 'Douay College,' it has ever been a pleasure to him to hear; they have ever brought to his recollection years of great happiness and scenes of great edification.

"It may be added, that the world has unavoidably found some way into these establishments since the inmates of them have been settled in England, and that their plan of education has been materially improved. Reading, arithmetic, geography, and modern history are systematically taught, and due regard is shown to manners.

"On two accounts, cheapness and universal equality of treatment, the foreign education of which we are speaking was entitled to the highest praise. The instruction, the dress, the board, the pocket-money, the ornamental accomplishments of music, dancing, and fencing, everything except physic, was defrayed by the moderate yearly sum of thirty pounds. There was no distinction of rank. When the late Duke of Norfolk was at Douay College, he rose at the same hour, studied and said his lessons in the same classes, ate at the same table, and wore the same uniform, as the other boys; the son of the Duke de St. Carlos did the same at Stonyhurst; the great Condé had done the same at the Loyolan College de Clermont" (pp. 4-8).

ART. VI.—LARGE OR SMALL SCHOOLS.

(By the Hon. and Rev. W. PETRE.)

[We have great pleasure in inserting this paper from the pen of the Hon. and Rev. W. Petre. We do not, of course, bind ourselves to concurrence with every single statement it contains ; but we are in most hearty sympathy with its general drift. At the same time those who read our article on "College Discipline" will see that there is one opinion here incidentally put forth by Mr. Petre, from which, if understood according to what seems the natural bearing of his words, we venture to differ *toto cœlo*.]

I DO not here propose to write a formal essay or to attempt an exhaustive treatment of the question of the relative merits of large and small schools. I shall confine myself to the indication of certain points and lines of consideration which seem to me to be suggestive, and likely, if followed up, to contribute to the solution of the problem of Catholic Liberal Education.

The argument outlined will be fully followed out in due course.

I. There are two essential functions of *moral** education ; in one of which education is a process directed to the *prevention* and *repression* of such vice and evil as boys may be taken to be addicted to when living in the society of one another ; the other that in which education is a process directed to the *awakening, developing, and confirming* of the *better qualities* which may exist in each boy *individually*.

The first of these functions may be called the *restrictive* function.

The second may be called the *formative* function.

The two processes must advance in due proportion and subordination to one another, or the moral value of any school system (no matter what its success when brought to an *intellectual* test) will be diminished, and perhaps even essentially endangered.

1. The *restrictive* function will be provided for in a right system of *surveillance* and its accompanying penal code.

2. The *formative* function will find play in the provisions made for suitable *personal influence* of master upon boy.

Surveillance, then, and *personal influence* are the two forces of moral education. They correspond respectively to the *social* and to the *individual* life of boys.

II. What is the sphere respectively in which these two forces are to work ?

* By *moral* education I mean to signify all that part of a boy's training which is neither strictly spiritual nor strictly intellectual.

Surveillance is provided for the anticipation and prevention of such positive evil as may be incident to the *social life* of boys, to their external relations with their superiors.

The social evils of boyish life are five :

1. Bullying.
2. Pilfering.
3. Bad language.
4. Immorality.

The evil which most frequently arises out of the external relation of boys to their masters is mainly one, viz.

5. Lying.

A word as to each of these evils.

1. *Bullying* is very apt to become prevalent at schools where there is a deficiency in supervision. Nearly everything in the social life of boys is determined by physical force or by the action of the lower moral and mental forces ; and as war, despotism, and tyranny are the constant accompaniments of incomplete civilization, so fighting and bullying will ever be the attendant evils of education yet imperfect.

2. *Pilfering* is a vice to which many little boys will yield in the face of strong temptation ; and once yielded to, the vice is apt to grow into a habit. Probably, however, the public opinion of the boys themselves, if judiciously encouraged, directed, and restrained by authority, will afford the most efficient means of combating the evil.

3. *Bad Language* of all kinds is remarkably apt to start and spread among boys. It affords facilities for swagger which are particularly tempting, and furnishes the most emphatic form for those superlatives which are so characteristic of the conversation of boys among themselves.

It will spread in a school like fire on a heath, and though in the last degree dangerous and objectionable, it is not in its first stages indicative of anything more than vanity and folly. Bad language generally first appears in the form of swearing, but it will rapidly proceed from swearing to immoral conversation and all the worst and most disastrous forms of license of the tongue. Surveillance will do something to restrain bad language, but it has been heard in some of its worst forms, and constantly, where surveillance has been in the most thorough exercise.

4. *Immorality*.—Are acts of impurity common among English boys carefully brought up at home, and before they reach early manhood ? Are boys under fifteen at all as a rule the victims of impure desires or morose delectations ? Are they not rather filled with thoughts of competition in schoolroom or playground, with

anticipations and discussions of play-days, of pleasures, of amusements?

But again, are they not remarkably prone to misconception in spiritual matters, to the forming of false consciences for themselves? Are they not, if susceptible in mind, apt to become scrupulous and over-timid, to imagine dangers where none exist, to make pictures of sin where no sin should be?

Are they not curious and observant, anxious to understand the reason and object of any restriction which seems forced or mysterious? Is it not easy to make occasions of sin for them out of circumstances essentially innocuous and unsuggestive? Are there not many actions which in themselves are in no way immodest, but which may become so if attention is concentrated upon them, or if they are made the objects of special and transparent precautionary legislation?

Is the standard of modesty as regards the ordinary actions of life identical in degree and in kind in the case of religious and of laymen?

Is it not the fact that boys, if once they fall into what they, rightly or wrongly, conceive to be mortal sin, are almost certain to repeat their fall more easily and to sink into greater and habitual wickedness?

Is it well that all the legislation of a school should seem to be directed to suggest the immediate presence of an occasion of sin?

There is a certain class of evils in regard of which it is most desirable that a youth should *hardly think of their existence*; his whole heart and interest being absorbed in other matters. But a kind of surveillance is possible which will be constantly reminding him that such things are, and which may produce in him a morbid, and in some sense dangerous, habit of introspection. And there is special danger that this kind of surveillance may come to exist, where on the one hand the superiors are truly conscientious, while on the other hand they entertain such general distrust of their pupils as that to which we refer.—DUBLIN REVIEW, "Catholic School Education," April, 1878.

5. *Lying*.—The habit of lying is generated in a variety of ways, and very rapidly, among boys. But certainly the chief cause of its generation is the overstraining of surveillance, and the too free use of punishment of all kinds. Boys will tacitly and instinctively resent and resist any interference beyond a certain point with their individual or collective liberty, and in doing this they will not hesitate to bend the eighth commandment. The tendency to agrarian outrage in Ireland is not unlike the tendency to falsehood in schools, both kinds of moral obliquity being oftener the result of the injudicious exercise of authority than of any rooted depravity.

It must of course always be borne in mind that boys if left to

themselves, and without congenial and healthy occupation, are deplorably apt to slide into swagger, evil conversation, and the mutual gratification of whatever evil curiosity they may happen to possess. In *most* cases, and especially with young boys, this evil curiosity is but slight, if amusement and lively occupation be plentiful, and if superiors are companionable, vivacious, and sympathetic.

But having known, as I have already said, the very evils which surveillance is intended to prevent, to flourish in its very midst, and having seen trickery and dissimulation practised to the full of boyish ingenuity under the strictest supervisory régime, I confess my conviction that, having provided duly for surveillance, an educator has but fulfilled a subordinate though essential part of his duty.

At the same time I must express my most warm, complete, and sympathetic approval of the statements of a writer in the last number of this Review, who thus speaks:—

There can hardly, we infer, be a greater calamity in any college or school than the existence therein of a *public opinion spontaneously generated among the students themselves*, by means of their mutual contact and intercourse. We say there can hardly be imagined a *more antichristian method of education than this*.

And to this add the testimony of another able writer (writing in 1810), which says much in support of a due system of surveillance:—

The morality of boys is generally very imperfect; their notions of honour generally extremely mistaken; and their objects of ambition frequently very absurd. The probability is, then, that the kind of discipline they exercise over each other will produce, *when left to itself*, a great deal of mischief. Our objection is not to the interference of boys in the formation of the character of boys; their character we are persuaded will be very imperfectly formed without their assistance; but *our objection is to that almost exclusive agency which they exercise in public schools*.

And again; note the words of an eminent Catholic educator and professor of moral theology:—

As his pupils gradually pass over into that state in which their reason assumes its independence, the educator should teach and encourage them to prosecute this holy warfare by their own *personal efforts*. Taught to endure greater toils and difficulties in proportion as their strength increases, they should become able, not only to refrain from forbidden objects, but also to *deny themselves many allowable pleasures*. The most important are, and must ever remain, a *lively faith in God*, a *filial love of Him*, and the *consequent fear of sin*.

It may be concluded, therefore, that surveillance in its special

and technical sense, though a necessary and proper function of educational process, will do but little *of itself*. Its necessity arises out of the difficulties incident to the individual treatment of boys in *large* numbers. Those difficulties are also indefinitely increased, if it is attempted to combine the duties of general surveillance with special intellectual training or with individual influence, in the person of a single superior; who, from want of experience, or from other causes, is deemed unfitted for a relation of close and unembarrassed intimacy with his boys. And it may be remarked that in proportion as it falls to a man to exercise the more detailed, stringent, literal, and mechanical duties of a system of surveillance, in that degree will he find difficulty in gaining the confidence individually of his charges. He will be restricted by the individual timidity and hesitation, no less than by the public opinion, of the boys, who will see in his efforts nothing but the attempt of a partial master to gratify his own sentimental feelings, or to play the spy upon them, and effect a conspiracy upon their liberties. The result will be, that the sensitive and promising boys, who most require sympathy, will not get it, and the influence of the lowest minds and coarsest sensibilities will rapidly gain the preponderance.—*Experto crede*.

And thus it may be seen that surveillance, however integral and important a part of a system of moral education, can be ranked as little more than a code of precautionary measures directed to the repression and punishment of evil.

III. I have now to consider the *formative* function of moral education, which, I have already said, consists in the process of awakening, developing, and confirming the good or excellent qualities which may exist in each boy individually.

In illustration of my meaning, I will quote the words of certain admitted judges.

1. A writer in the DUBLIN REVIEW, speaking of the disastrous effects produced by a public opinion "spontaneously generated among boys themselves" on any matter of moral importance, says:—

It is friendly and habitual intercourse with superiors of matured piety, which alone can furnish security to the students against this grievous calamity. . . . It must be carefully borne in mind that the fact of sacerdotal celibacy enables Catholic superiors to be integral living and energizing members of their society, with a completeness differing *in kind* from that attainable by the married or marrying Protestant master. . . . This atmosphere of Christian thought, we say, on which we lay stress, will be largely due to the active exertion of superiors, and cannot be possibly secured without that exertion. We do not, of course, mean that they will apply themselves of set purpose to administer moral disquisitions in play-time, but just the contrary. It is in proportion as their talk is *free* from

every artificial purpose—in proportion as it is the spontaneous outcome of their thoughts—that it will achieve the desired end. It will imply, as a matter of course, a certain moral estimate of men, of actions, of literature, and that estimate the Christian one. A good man's conversation will not be the less attractive, the less abounding in poetical imagination, or humour, or knowledge of character, or apt expression, or provocativeness of joyousness and mirth, because he is a good man. He differs from a worldly man, not in that he is less engaging, less joyous, or less influential, but in that he throws the whole weight of his influence into God's scale. It is where, on one hand, the superiors are truly pious and interior—men also who possess the art of exhibiting piety in the form most attractive to youth—while, on the other hand, they are on terms of the *most intimate and familiar intercourse with those under their charge*,—that the whole college will tend to be pervaded by that true moral judgment of men and actions, which is the one most momentous constituent of Catholic intellectual education. And a wise body of superiors will regard this friendly intercourse with the pupils,—not as an episodal or subordinate matter which is to come into play when no other occupation happens to press—but on the contrary as amongst their most sacred and absolutely indispensable duties.

And again another authority :—

The very meaning of education seems to us to be that the old should teach the young, the wise direct the weak ; that a man who professes to instruct, *should get among his pupils, study their characters, gain their affections, and form their inclinations and aversions*. In a public school the numbers render this impossible ; it is impossible that sufficient time should be found for this useful and affectionate interference. Boys, therefore, are left to their own crude conceptions, and ill-formed propensities ; and this neglect is called a *spirited and manly education*.

IV. So that it would appear that in a house of education due attention must be given

1° to *Restrictive* influence,

2° to *Formative* influence.

But that, as the duty of formation is indefinitely the more *noble* work and the more fertile of result, anything which may stand in the way of individual treatment and personal influence—the formative function—should be regarded with jealousy, and should be minimized to the utmost.

By the aid of a scheme such as I have indicated, we may shape our thoughts as to what should be the essential constitution of a school, in order that with a minimum of restriction, a maximum of excellence in degree and in kind may be secured of *individual moral development*.

For my own part, I have little hesitation in affirming my conviction that the first but more unwelcome necessity of education, viz. *supervision* or surveillance, *by the very fact of its necessity*,

concludes the argument between large and small schools much in favour of small schools.

For boys are necessarily mixed so heterogeneously in a school numbering anything over forty (and *that* is almost too large a number), that it is impracticable that the superior should gain a knowledge of each individually. He will see (and lay too much stress on) the points in which they resemble one another, and will be apt to look with something approaching contempt, upon any suggestion that they are other than objects of general and collective legislation. But even if individual treatment should happen to be in theory advocated in a large school, there will always be among its numbers a certain number of boys of corrupt mind, who, of surveillance be relaxed, will spread sedition and mischief far and wide. These are boys who will band together to foster evil, who will resist authority as far as they dare, who will morally and physically oppress the weaker and more susceptible boys, and who, with the perverse ingenuity of ill-disposed youth, will endeavour at all opportunities to throw discredit upon healthy discipline and personal influence; and will be bent on little else than dethroning the sovereignty of peace, gentleness, charity, and order, in order to establish the usurpation of their own low, rowdy, and animal views of human aims and human life. And even granting that such boys are not absolutely and formally corrupt, their "ideas of morality will be very imperfect, their notions of honour extremely mistaken, and their objects of ambition, for the most part, extremely absurd." It will become necessary that their influence and action should in many cases be arbitrarily and habitually restricted by superiors; surveillance will have to be rigidly enforced, often in its sternest and most repressive form. And if exception be made of those who are well-disposed and well-behaved, if *they* are permitted such relaxation of stern discipline as their special cases may require, the words of a late writer in this Review will rapidly become verified, and the superiors will be charged with favouritism, the quieter boys with "sneaking," and in the event, the discipline and economy of the school, if it does not lapse altogether, must sink to a mediocrity, which is but a compromise inclining to the lower and, for the time, stronger class of interests. Where anything like a complete system of surveillance is attempted over large numbers, I believe the result is uniformly mediocre, and if fairly good, only so at the expense of what is best.

And it must also be noted that in repressing the evil doings of evil-doers, measures will have to be resorted to which will scandalize the weak. Suspicion, mistrust, and precaution will breed timidity, curiosity, and concealment among those who normally are childlike, innocent, and openhearted, but whose conscience is im-

mature and sensitive, whose passion of fear is easily excited, whose reason and common sense are not as yet sufficiently robust and experienced to distinguish between what is essentially and what is merely incidentally wrong. A large school must, I fear, but too often be the untranquil scene of a battle between law and order on the one side, and license and stupidity on the other.

A Catholic writer, speaking of his experiences as a Catholic of a large Catholic school, says of its social life—

Some were kind and compassionate in a sort of blunt way; *but it was the world, and had the world's ways.* Every one was in a hurry, every one was for himself. There were a few plums and good things to be struggled for, and as in the world also, the strongest and most forward got them,—*the shy and the weaker went to the wall.*

Let it be remembered that among the "shy and the weaker" who "go to the wall" are but too often the gentlest characters, the most promising dispositions, the keenest and most thoughtful intellects. "The vastness, the bleakness, the rough busy multitude, noisy and rude" (I quote the same Catholic author), "the picture of that cold cruel world" which comes to men all too soon, will assuredly be anticipated with all its evil results of cramped sympathies and habitual wariness, which, however inevitable in mature life, are qualities as unsightly in a boy as physical deformity, if it be still really necessary that the domestic ideal should be so completely (but let us hope temporarily) obscured as at present among Catholic schools. The very fact that these schools yearn after this ideal, and endeavour by far-fetched rhetorical expedient to liken themselves in imagination thereto, the very fact that grave and venerable men speak of even Catholic schools as "boy-barracks," is in itself sufficient evidence of the fact that as yet Catholic liberal education is somewhat crudely and indefinitely conceived in theory, and correspondingly imperfect in practice.

That parental influence and tenderness which is the highest endowment, potentially, of the celibate educator, should be allowed, perhaps, somewhat freer play than hitherto.

What antithesis can possibly be stronger than that which is implied in the word "barracks" as opposed to the word "home."

I must, therefore, conclude that until some system of subdivision analogous to that implied in the "dames' houses" and "tutors' houses" of the English public schools is devised and put into practice by Catholics, we shall still continue to suffer from the disadvantages of large schools, and still cry without result for those advantages of personal and individual influence, combined with minute and intelligent but elastic surveillance, and domesticity of life, which are the special and peculiar characteristics of well-managed small schools.

WILLIAM PETRE.

ART. VII.—CANOSSA.

Life of Gregory VII., preceded by a Sketch of the History of the Papacy to the Eleventh Century. By M. A. F. VILLEMAIN, of the Academy. Translated by T. B. BROCKLEY. London : Bentley & Co., 1874.

M. VILLEMAIN is an enemy, but an intelligent enemy, of the great Pontiff whose life he has written, or rather of the Papacy itself. More recent research has deprived his work of much of its value, but it will certainly remain honourably distinguished from the random and flimsy attacks of many more pretentious writers. If we have taken it as our theme in the following remarks, we have done so, hardly so much, because it is, to say the least, not the work of a partisan, but of a critic, and no friendly one, as, because it affords a marked contrast to the pretentious solemnity of so many of our own writers on this and on many kindred themes.

"Solemnity," says La Rochefoucauld, "is a mystery of the body, which serves to hide the defects of the mind," and, though the aphorism is too sweeping and biting, yet there is a great deal of truth in it, as most of us, no doubt, have often had occasion to remark. For, who is there that does not call to mind with some amusement and, perhaps, some irritation, a specimen or two of the solemn race, who, having nothing to say, say it with a pomp of diction, or, at least, of manner, which conceals from the many, and only more certainly reveals to the few, the poverty of the land, as reeds or sedges, slenderly mask the sandy soil which their presence betrays. So it is apt to be with writers who have to write to order (and to time) on topics of which their knowledge is slight, and their judgment passed beforehand with a peremptory certitude, for which the first condition is a good solid and contented ignorance.

Of all the fields (and they are ample and various) on which solemnity of style expatiates, there is none so adapted for its gorgeous and bland manœuvres, or the impetus of its calculated ferocities, as the wide plain of what such writers delight in dignifying by the name of "Ecclesiastical history." What scope indeed is here for the "solemn" and the "impressive"! The very first mention of the subject calls up a crowd of phrases, on which a vast amount of solemnity may be transacted, totally irrespective of any kind or degree of knowledge of the subject. In awe-struck silence the meek reader of leader or of re-

view, prostrated and hidden, as it were, beneath his deference to sound, allows the pompous procession to sweep by unchallenged. He cowers and cringes, while the insatiable ambition of haughty Pontiffs, the crafty devices of curial astuteness, the glitter of imposing solemnities, the thunders of the Vatican, the terrors of superstition, and an endless array of such "sound and fury, signifying—nothing," marshals him some way that he should go. Interrogate him—nay, interrogate the writer as to the meaning of the spectacle, and but little indeed can be extracted by the most searching analysis; but this is precisely what the solemn writer does not wish to submit his work to. He issues his paper at par, and trusts to the exigencies of the occasion, to give and maintain its currency, at least, for the time being. We could not well have a better specimen of the Church history topic, viewed as an occasion for solemn writing, than the episode of Canossa, whose eighth centenary occurred last year. The bare mention that such was the fact, sufficed to make more than one pompous pen to leap from its scabbard, and perform preliminary gambades of this corporal mystery, portending unutterable things, such as may have been supposed to lurk under Sterne's marbled and ink-veiled pages in the veracious biography of Mr. Shandy.

One can easily imagine the scribe, as excited as solemn people can be, his eyes glistening and his mouth watering at the mere thought of the astute Hildebrand (or the haughty Gregory), the lovely, or the masculine Countess Matilda, the unfortunate Henry, the ruthless sentence, the inhuman penance, and all the usual literary *mise en scène* of such an improving topic. Thus does a solemn leader usher in the welcome topic—welcome, that is, in September: * "With a courage worthy of the subject and of the occasion, the Vatican proposes to celebrate the eighth centenary of Henry IV.'s submission at Canossa." Then we are told how precisely identical is the attitude of the Holy See now with that of S. Gregory VII., but forthwith consoled with the reflection that though "the ceremony to which the Catholic world is now invited, is the glorification of Hildebrand, in his most furious form; still, in the opinion of that period and of all subsequent ages, it was the most outrageous act of the most domineering of Popes."

The Catholic world was not invited to anything, it is true, but it might have been invited; and, if it had been invited, who knows what might have happened? At any rate, the hypothesis is good as a basis for rating "the Vatican" and sneering at the "Catholic world." So lofty a beginning is worthily

* The "Times," of September 27, 1876.

followed up by such flights of eloquence as the following:—"Crossing the Alps in the depths of winter, he (Henry), went straight to Canossa, far south, near the Adriatic coast, and announced to Hildebrand that he was ready to do anything he required. He arrived before the portals of the Castle in February, 1077. Within those portals was the Pontiff, more stern, more tempestuous, and more unrelenting than the elements that raged around, and with him was the famous Matilda, Countess of Tuscany, fair, tender, and susceptible; above all, a zealous supporter of the highest Papal pretensions. From the windows of the Castle the amiable pair enjoyed for three days a kindly spectacle. It was an emperor standing in the open air, bareheaded and with bare feet, naked, except for a rag thrown round his middle, supplicating with piteous gestures the compassion of the happy couple under cover. Admitted on the fourth day, the poor wretch received absolution and nothing more." If this is not fine writing, we know not what is. It is of no moment that the "facts" of the description are evolved from somewhere else than history, and the logic from somewhere else than Aldrich; what matters it that Canossa is not "far south" in the peninsula, but in North Italy; nor, that it is not so "near the Adriatic" as it is to the gulf of Genoa; nor, that the sternness, tempestuousness, and unrelenting character of the Pontiff, are as gratuitous as the raging of the elements without; nor, that Henry was not naked, but clad in woollen; nor, that Matilda was neither specially fair, tender, nor susceptible, being a widowed princess, on the shady side of thirty, and of uncommon force of character. The writing is "fine," what do you require more?* The little traits of "enjoying the kindly spectacle," and the "happy couple," are telling; strictly the writer's they betray, we suppose, his own tendencies, not those of his historic personages, of whom we read nought in contemporary writers, to warrant his hypothesis; but quite the reverse. The final stroke of "absolution, and nothing more"; as, who should say, "not even five o'clock tea, or a glass of warm negus, did they vouchsafe the poor dear man!" is very effective. It so happens that the Pope asked him to dinner, and that he accepted the invitation; but "history," of the order we are citing, takes no heed of such trifles, and so calls dinner "nothing." For our part, we are not "historians," but we venture to suggest to the eloquent and solemn writer in

* The late Lord Chancellor Eldon was an admirer of port wine. A young barrister once ventured to ask him at or after dinner whether he found the port wine good? His Lordship is recorded to have said, "Sir, *all* port wine is good. It is black, it is sweet, and it is inebriating—what more do you want?" Is not "fine writing" somewhat similar?

question, that we not only know that Kaiser Henry dined with the Pope, but we are certain of what he dined on. He undoubtedly, on that occasion, partook of "humble pie"; or, as our eloquent writer might say, he devoured the pastry of humiliation. We are sorry to disappoint our readers, if they expect greater things; but whatever we may write under the name of Canossa, we cannot say it will be a "portrait in this style," for our plan does not admit of "solemnity." We can only pretend to recite in a matter-of-fact way, following Villemain as our chief modern authority, what sort of a sovereign was Henry IV. of Germany, and what the times and the Pope which rendered the scene of Canossa possible, and its results, not a speculation, but history.

And first, as to the character of the times.

We will, as briefly as we can, sketch a few *tableaux-vivants* of the state of European society in the eleventh century, towards the end of which Hildebrand was called to rule the Universal Church. Let us begin with a picture of Rome about the middle of the century. The young Hildebrand, brought up on the Aventine from childhood* under the shadow of Peter, had thence passed to the renowned austerities of Cluny, where, under the great and holy Odilon, he learned the practice of virtue and the power of sanctity, a brother novice of that King Casimir whom Cluny refused to his sometime rebellious but now repentant nobles, until Pope Benedict IX. released him from his vows. How long Hildebrand remained in Burgundy is not certain; but when, still young, he returned to Rome, a strange and a bewildering sight awaited him. At the Lateran, Benedict IX., himself infected with the stains of intrusion and of simony, but still at this time the legitimate Pope, reigned, and lived in sin. Thrice deposed, he was thrice restored to the dishonoured throne of Peter, before he finally retired to expiate his sins in the Basilian convent of Grotta Ferrata. If Hildebrand walked from his old home, S. Mary's, on the Aventine, through the Forum, and up the Esquiline Hill, he would see the Anti-Pope, John XX., enthroned at S. Mary Majors; and across the Tiber another (Sylvester III.) kept unholy vigils at the Limina Apostolorum. And as it was in Rome, so it was throughout Italy, disorder and confusion, wrong and corruption reigned on every side. The roads were infested with bands of armed robbers, and the cities, like Rome itself, exposed to the violence of chiefs who professed to defend or attack contending Pontiffs, while they agreed at least in the one point of enriching themselves at the expense of their unfortunate victims. Learn-

* Acta SS. Maii, vol. vi. 105.

ing and the arts were sheltered here and there within the walls of religious houses, but among the many a profound ignorance of Christian doctrine was allied with the lingering superstitions of that heathenism whose classic remains met the eye at every step, especially in Rome itself. Nor was the next turn which events took calculated to reassure the mind of Hildebrand, although it consisted in the elevation of his own beloved and revered master, the arch-priest Gratian, to the Pontifical throne; for, though all tends to show that Gratian, who reigned under the title of Gregory VI., was not infected with the guilt of simony, and though his Pontificate was marked by many much-needed reforms, yet his speedy deposition, and the acknowledgment which he made that he had allowed the use of money to determine his predecessor to resign, forbid us to regard him as a precursor of his great pupil, Gregory VII. The Emperor Henry III. coerced Gregory VI. to resign the Pontificate, and placed on the throne of Peter his Chancellor, Suidger, Bishop of Bamberg, under the name of Clement II. Following his deposed master in his exile to the banks of the Rhine, where he soon died, Hildebrand thence retired again to Cluny. Meanwhile Clement and his immediate successor, also a prelate of Henry's court, who reigned but twenty days, under the name of Damasus II., both died within a few months, and the Romans again sought a new Pope at the hands of the Emperor. His choice fell on Bruno, Bishop of Toul, afterwards S. Leo IX.; and it was at Worms, where the Emperor held a diet to deliberate on the choice of a Pontiff, that Hildebrand (sent there by his Abbot) first had occasion to broach to Bruno himself the momentous truth by which the well-nigh extinguished liberties of the Church had to be re-integrated. Bruno proposed to take him with him to Rome. "I cannot go with you," answered the young monk. "But why not?" asked the new Pope. "Because without canonical institution, and by royal and secular appointment alone, you are going to lay hands on the See of Rome." Struck by the utterance of this profound conviction, Bruno at once declared that he would go to Rome, but would by no means become Pope unless a free and canonical election by the clergy and people of the Roman Church gave him a title to the Apostolic See.

Such is the account given by a contemporary, Bruno Astensis (Op., vol. ii. 147), of the bright dawn of Hildebrand's direct influence on the Papacy some twenty years before he was destined himself to wear the tiara—then, as now, a crown of thorns.

S. Leo's Pontificate was that of a saint, a web and a woof of wondrous deeds and deepest sufferings. Let us follow him for a few moments in two different scenes. Outside the walls and

at the very gates of Rome is the ancient and splendid foundation of S. Paul's. S. Leo having named Hildebrand Apostolic sub-deacon and almoner of the Roman Church, appointed him Abbot of this monastery and head of its Patriarchal Basilica. The vices of the clergy at that time were epitomized in this venerable foundation of Benedictines, second only to that of Monte Cassino; for the dignity of abbot had been sold again and again to the highest bidder, and the monks were infected with the sin of incontinence. The very church had become a stable for cattle, and the religious men were waited on by females in the refectory.* Into this Augæan stable Hildebrand brought morality by order and by discipline, so that the monastery which had been the type of scandal and offence became the model of observance; and with the observance of rule within its walls, the new Abbot combined an energy and skill which freed its lands and dependents from the encroachments and violence of the neighbouring barons.

But, as we have said, the evils to which S. Leo's sub-deacon laid his hand in his own monastery were those which infected the whole of Christendom at that time. The superior clergy attempted in vain to correct the disorders of their inferiors, so long as they themselves lay justly open to the charge of simony, which these latter retorted on them. At a Council held at Constance in 1045, Henry III. had said these words in the hearing of many: "Ye who ought to have been a blessing to all around you, degrade yourselves by covetousness and avarice both by buying and selling holy things. It is by practices such as these that plague, and war, and famine are drawn down upon the nations." But it was not in the power of the State to apply the only remedy to these evils. The sanction which is needed to heal deep social wounds such as these, is one which neither king nor kaiser can command, either at that time or at the present, or at any other, but only that one in whose charge is the "tree of life, whose leaves are for the healing of the nations." The witness of the Emperor applies to his own wide realm. Let us now see whether his invective might have a still wider application. S. Leo IX. convoked a Council at Rheims in 1049, at which a great number of Bishops and Abbots of the various provinces which owned the suzerainty of the King of France assisted. When the Gospel of our Lord's charge to Peter—"If thy brother hath sinned against thee, forgive him"—had been sung, the Pope commanded silence, while the Chancellor of the Roman Church read the long list of abuses prevalent in the Churches of Gaul in contempt of the canons

* Paul of Bernried.

and of the law of God. At the head of these were simony and the usurpation of sacerdotal functions by the laity. He then called on all present to give their aid to the Pope to uproot these ill weeds, which prevented the growth of the Divine harvest; and, addressing himself to the Bishops, he told them that if they had been guilty of obtaining their sees by simony, or had sold preferment for money themselves, they were now to confess publicly these crimes, under pain of the Pontifical excommunication. The Archbishops of Tours, Lyons, and Besançon declared they were guiltless in this matter; but the Archbishop of Rheims was convicted of these and other crimes of the gravest kind. The Bishop of Langres was similarly arraigned and found guilty of simony, armed violence, homicide, and adultery; and a priest deposed that he had caused him to be tortured in order to extract from him a sum of money. The Archbishop of Lyons defended him from the charge of inflicting torture, but admitted the extortion of money. The Archbishop of Besançon attempted to defend him, but his voice failed him utterly, and on the next day he confessed that this was a supernatural chastisement for an attempt which his conscience had not sanctioned. The Bishops of Nevers, of Dôle, and of Nantes were also proved guilty of simony and other irregularities, as were various abbots and dignitaries. A similar Council, held shortly afterwards by the Pope at Mainz, was characterized by the revelation and punishment of the same wickedness in high places; and the excommunication of all the bishops in Gaul and in Germany who were not legitimately prevented from attendance at these Councils, tends to show that their absence was owing to the fact that they were liable to similar and equally well-founded accusations. The letters of S. Leo and of the great Cardinal-Bishop, S. Peter Damian, abundantly testify that such scandals, nay, even graver and more atrocious ones, were most prevalent in the Italian peninsula and in all the Churches of southern Europe. Though nearer the Papal See, and in part subject to its temporal sway, these fearful evils, some of which are of a dye which we cannot even allude to, had so corroded the clergy that even the twofold power of the Pope in his own dominions, and the scourge of foreign invasion in the form of Robert Guiscard and his fierce Normans throughout Italy, were not sufficient to restrain them; and stringent, or, as we should now say, cruel, as were the provisions of the Councils of Rome held by S. Leo, the jealousies of rulers, and corruptions brought to bear by princes and clergy on each other, deprived these canons of adequate effect. While piety and morality thus had perished or decayed in their very homes, political and social order and freedom were lost in the general flood, and S. Leo had to seek in

person in Germany for a handful of brave men who should dare with him to resist the invasion of the Normans. His Italian troops fled at the first shock, and the Pope from his prison at Benevento governed the Universal Church, and was consoled by its warmest sympathies, while his own virtues and sufferings, enhanced by the voluntary penances which he inflicted on himself, softened his rugged jailers, and at length restored him to his own city. Here, in the midst of S. Peter's nave, S. Leo breathed out his saintly spirit. Three days he lay dying before the tomb of the Apostles. Through the last night, in the silence of the great temple, he prayed not in vain, saying, "O God, I pray not that my name may be exalted, but that Thou wouldst magnify the Holy See to Thy glory!" At dawn the bells summoned cardinals, bishops, priests, and people to the church; the dying Pontiff, supported by more than human strength, rose, and leaning on two attendants, reached the high altar, where, being laid on the ground, he wept and prayed long and fervently, and then, shriven and fed with the Bread of Life at a Mass celebrated by one of the bishops, he besought silence and breathed his last in the sight of the reverent and motionless multitude. Great and holy, S. Leo IX. closed his eyes on a world which as yet bore too slender evidence of his success as a reformer. But there stood among those who surrounded his sublime death-bed one, the Apostolic Subdeacon Hildebrand, whose sterner graces were to follow up the work which S. Leo had but begun. His first public act was to secure the nomination of Gebhard, Bishop of Eichstädt in Bavaria, to the Pontifical throne, which he ascended under the name of Victor II., in April, 1055. The succeeding year saw the death of both Pope and Emperor in the prime of life, and the election, to which Hildebrand was certainly no stranger, of Cardinal Frederick of Lothringen, to the vacant chair of Peter, under the style of Stephen IX. His brother Gottfried had married Beatrice, the widowed mother of Matilda, heiress to the Marquisate of Tuscany, and in her right ruled over her hereditary dominions. Beatrice and Matilda, then a child, were the attached spiritual children of Hildebrand, and it was by his influence that Pope Victor had obtained from the Emperor, Henry III., the restoration of her territory which he had occupied in consequence of the second marriage, without his leave, of Beatrice to his vassal. Stephen sent Hildebrand to Germany to disarm the resentment of the Imperial Court at his independent election, and here he made his friend the widowed Empress Agnes, whose son, Henry IV., was then a child of five years old. While he was on this mission Pope Stephen died at Florence, charging the Roman clergy with his last breath to

elect no other than Cardinal Hildebrand as his successor. Scattering by the energy and authority of his will and character the adherents of an anti-Pope, styled Benedict X., Hildebrand averted his own election and secured that of the Bishop of Florence in that city, whom he persuaded Gottfried to support with the force of arms. Then accompanying the new Pope, Nicholas II., to Rome as first Deacon, he became the soul of that Council (in April 1059), in which Berengarius and his errors were condemned, and his books consigned to the fires which Hildebrand is said to have lit with his own hands.

His energy was more sternly exercised, however, in the decrees which Nicholas published for the reform of the clergy, and especially of the Chapters and other regulars living under vow in community. But, above all, he devoted himself to release the Roman Church from the trammels of State control, whether it took the form of brutal violence in the invasion of her territory by local feudatories or robbers on a grand scale, such as Guiscard and his Normans, or that of Imperial interference with her inherent rights as mother and mistress of all Churches. On the death of Pope Nicholas, in 1061, Hildebrand, who had exercised more and more that great influence which his lofty aims and his integrity had earned, found himself for the first time not merely the real but the ostensible head of the great and powerful party in Rome, which aimed at the permanent emancipation of the Church from the disastrous control of the German Emperor. Besides these, who were by far the greater number both of the clergy and laity, there was a party consisting of some few German Cardinals, or others who, for reasons best known to them, preferred a transalpine suzerainty to one nearer home, and who opposed the known wishes of Hildebrand that a new Pope should at once be elected in Rome without reference to the Emperor. In these parties we see the germ of the Guelphs and Ghibellines of succeeding ages. Hildebrand rallied to him and the candidate of the Roman Church, those who wished to see an end put to the scandals and vices of the times, and especially the great masses of mendicant religious, whom he had always protected. On the other side was every element of rapine, of vice and of laxity. The Lombard bishops, who openly lived with those whom they called their wives, rallied round Guilbert, the Emperor's Chancellor and Bishop of Parma, and in a synod determined to petition Henry for a Pope from their own province, who would have compassion, as they said, on their infirmities. Hildebrand, to smooth the way to concord, had consented to send Cardinal Stephen to the Emperor's court with letters of credence from the Roman Church, but he was unceremoniously

dismissed by the officers of the court, and his letters not even opened, while the messengers of the Imperial party in Rome, and those of the Lombard bishops, were honourably entertained. The views of Hildebrand and of his adversaries were well expressed in the persons of the rival candidates whom they respectively put forward: the one was Anselm, Bishop of Lucca, a man of irreproachable life, and renowned for the clemency and gentleness of his disposition; the other, Cadaloüs, whose licentious life gave every guarantee desired by his supporters in Lombardy and at the Imperial court. Undeterred by the manifest irregularity of an appointment in which the Roman Church and people had not even a nominal share, or by the prophetic warnings addressed to him by S. Peter Damian, that if he usurped the throne of Peter he should die within the year, Cadaloüs, calling himself Honorius II., set out aided by the Lombards to besiege Rome. Duke Gottfried, accompanied by his wife and her child Matilda, who, though but fifteen years old, showed herself in the field, and influenced the zeal of the defenders of the Church, speedily defeated Honorius, and succoured the city. The legitimate Pope, Alexander II., aided by Gottfried, then obtained undisturbed possession of his See, and the nefarious intruder died in obscurity, though persisting in his pretensions to the end. The gentle and persuasive eloquence of Pope Alexander gained to his side many of the Lombard bishops, who obeyed his summons to the Council which he held at Mantua. The rest of his pontificate, of ten years, was passed in similar efforts to check the tide of simony and corruption which had so long overflowed the Church, especially in Germany. The young Emperor and Princes, and even the Archbishops and Bishops of many of the great sees were deeply involved in the sacrilegious traffic in holy things, and Henry was eminent not only in this but in many other vices public and private, so that his reign even then had become a tyranny, and his court a scandal to the whole empire. The atrocious cruelties he perpetrated in Saxony, from hatred and jealousy of his rival, Otho V. of Saxony and Bavaria, his cession of several provinces to the Danes, his obscene life and detestable conduct to his wife Bertha, made him odious to all but the nefarious participators in his crimes; and on all of these points, which his defenders can neither deny nor palliate, the Pope again and again remonstrated, and threatened him with the extremest penalties of the Church. Every prince, whether lay or ecclesiastical, under his suzerainty, by turns had to suffer from his violence for his fraud, and if he had not had the good fortune, as some esteem it, to be the very type of Ghibelline opposition to the

Pope, it is hard to conceive that he should ever have found a defender. His exploits were the public sale of bishoprics and abbeys. Canonries, even rectories and such smaller game, were not beneath his notice; and if leading journals had existed in those days they would have contained, no doubt, the sort of advertisements which still in this favoured land grace their columns, setting forth the conditions of sale with all the attractions of moderate terms, advanced age of present incumbent, speedy hope of possession, interest on the purchase-money in the interim, neat parsonage, small population, pleasant society, cheap education for children, excellent fishing, nice garden, very little to do, and a good deal of money or money's worth to reap, and all this to the highest bidder; inquiries to be addressed to Kaiser Heinrich & Co., at Worms or Goslar, as the case might be, and the bargain to proceed totally irrespective of the merits of the purchaser, moral, mental, or other, save only the length of his purse. If Pope Alexander had lived, there is every reason to believe that he who had already done so much to reform the simoniacal practices of many in Italy, who had ably followed up and seconded the labours of our great Archbishop Lanfranc in similar reforms in England, would have attacked this evil in Germany in the person of the Emperor, its chief source and origin. This Pope had despatched to him again and again remonstrances couched in paternal but straightforward terms, and in the last weeks of his life he sent, by the Archbishops of Cologne and Bambray, minatory letters, in which he declared that Henry had exhausted the indulgence of Heaven, and summoned him to answer before the tribunal of the Apostolic See for his numerous crimes and sacrileges. The reception of these letters by his subjects of all degrees, with respect and approbation, shows how well they were justified by Henry's conduct, and this, it seems just to say, was the cause of his show of penitence, which subsequent events indicated to have been altogether insincere.

The death of the Pope, in April, 1072, gives us the occasion briefly to sum up the sketch we have attempted of the state of things ecclesiastical when Hildebrand at length, and sorely against his will, was called overtly to rule the Church, in whose fortunes he had so long merged himself. For twenty years and more this wonderful man had set himself to stand for the house of Israel, and amidst the calamities of his own land, and especially of Rome itself, the sacrilegious occupations of the See of Peter by simultaneous and by successive anti-Popes, the ferocity of civil war, the overwhelming invasions of the Northmen, and the still more appalling evils of corruption, license, and laxity in every country, and in every Church in Europe, in

clergy, and in people from the highest to the lowest, he had slowly and laboriously built up materials out of which he was to construct the abiding liberties of the children of God. Wrong and robbery, violence, fraud, crimes of the foulest dye, were rife in France, in Germany, in Italy, in Spain, and in England. The princes had taken council against the Lord and against his Christ, and the people were as sheep without shepherds, for their pastors were too often hirelings, and fed themselves and not their flocks. They had bought for money the cure of souls, and fattened their own flesh with the blood of souls redeemed by Christ. And this being the state of the Christian commonwealth, how was it to be amended? What potent spell should be found sufficient to exorcise the evil spirit of the age, whose name was Legion; and who was to prevail to use it?

The answer is to be found in the Pontificate of S. Gregory VII.: from his election at Rome, in 1073, till his death at Salerno, in 1085, he fought but one battle, and conquered the one foe. The form which Christendom had taken was as symmetrical and as definite as any which human society has ever assumed. The whole of the Western world was esteemed one commonwealth under one supreme civil ruler, the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire.

An elective and a constitutional sovereign, he had to account in Diet to his electors for his stewardship, and as both he and they were the creations of the Church, her laws were theirs, and her sanctions, while they gave authority to princes and taught their subjects to obey them for conscience sake, became the stay and refuge of the people, and the only secure foundation of all and every right. No one in this theory was above the law, for the law was the law of Christ, and kings and emperors were as much His lieges as were the humblest of their vassals. That such a system as this should be left to itself, to work itself out as it best could, was an impossibility. No one can pretend that it was spontaneously generated, and as its beginning was plainly the direct result of the Christian revelation, so its continuance, except on the hypothesis of the one coherent and exclusive revelation, was antecedently impossible.* This revelation includes both the departure of Christ's

* The Apostolic command, to obey civil rulers for conscience sake, weights the subject with a pressure which would be intolerable unless the ruler was controlled by an analogous obligation. Two methods only to effect this are conceivable. One is that of the advocates of the right to rebel, whose sanctions are the bayonet or the barricade, and whose appeal is to the axe. The other is that of which we are now speaking, viz., the recognition of one definite judge of all such controversies as arise between governors and sub-

visible presence from this world till the restitution of all things,* and also the delegation of all His inherent powers over all to a Vicar,† the successor of Peter. The Christian commonwealth, therefore, was to be ruled mediately, but really, by this visible representative of its unseen Master and Lord, in whom was based all right, and all order, and all law, by consequence. S. Gregory, therefore, knew that if the Christian world was salvable, his was the power to effect its healing; and as the head of the civil order had become the seat of its chief disease, he was borne, as by the necessary logic of the case, to grapple in mortal struggle with the Emperor. S. Gregory's success was no doubt in his eyes most desirable, for he could not be blind to its utility for the Church of God, that is, for the salvation of souls; but what raised him infinitely above success or failure, and made him a hero, was his profound conviction of his own character and mission as Christ's Vicar on earth, the source and foundation of all right and of all truth. Unpalatable as this theory of right may now be, and loudly declaimed against by people too who are esteemed great statesmen, have we ever yet seen any other intelligible theory on this subject that does not ultimately resolve itself into the theory of force, or right of the strong? and yet further, may we not say that whatever merit such other theories may claim, they certainly have never, as a fact, produced anything approaching to the results (either for magnitude or for duration) of the Christian theory. Of all the wrong-headed views of history begotten in these later ages, that which teaches men to regard the mediæval Popes, and especially S. Gregory VII. as aggressors on civil society is the most transparently perverse. The German kaisers and other secular rulers in France, England, Italy, and the other Christian lands were the perpetual aggressors on religious as well as on civil freedom in every form. As Balmez has well noted, the Christian idea had worked out the great social and political problems of the ages which succeeded the mighty downfall of Imperial Rome always and invariably in one sense, and the "right Divine to govern wrong" was no part of it. It was the Church, and eminently the Papal See, that had converted the successive scourges of God and their

jects, whose award should be final because his authority is supreme. A religion without such a provision for the adjustment of a difference which is practically perennial, would *à priori* be convicted of incompetency in the widest field of natural human relation, that of the political order. Moreover, such a religion could not be the historic religion of which we read in the four Gospels and other books of the New Testament.

* Acts iii. 20, 21.

† Matt. xvi. 19. Luke xxii. 32. John xxi. 16, 17.

savage followers to the meek wisdom of the Incarnate Word ; her hands, while she regenerated nation after nation to eternal life, had endowed one and all with one and the same type of political and social institutions, and so given them the fulfilment of the Divine promise, "in this world a hundredfold" increase of every earthly blessing, "and in that which is to come, life eternal." Hordes of lawless savages thus became organized commonwealths, and every tyro in history knows that the forms of their political being were copies of the Church's own organization, monarchical and representative. She alone had preserved in her hierarchy and in her synods the living tradition of government properly so called ; and the authority of her bishops and their assessors, by its sanctions sacred and inviolable, in its exercise paternal, in its results fruitful of the happiness of the greater number, was transferred by a natural process, gradual, spontaneous, enduring, as such processes are, to the civil order. In every land (and most of all in this our own) where she passed, the Church made kings moderate by the very same process by which she made their people submissive. Bending *all* beneath the equal yoke of Christ, she created the Christian polity as she had created first the Christian man and then the Christian family, by laws full of life, and truth, and power. This concrete exhibition of the principles laid up in her at the first by Christ Himself and by His Apostles,* the Christian State, was the direct outcome of the Christian Church and its ultimate expression. That such a conception should persevere unchanged by any human causes contained within it, such as the passions of men, was of course impossible. Intimately related, as cause and effect, the Church and the State became in process of time, as it were, identified, and in this close union lay seeds of corruption ; for, as ancestral piety and the needs of the poor led on to endowments, and riches and privileges were accumulated by bishops and priests in corporation or sole, their offices became objects for the calculations of ambition and of avarice, and thus the very fountains of the Church's life as well as that of the State became tainted. The civil power everywhere, even in the Apostolic See, had invaded the ecclesiastical, and now by violent wresting from the clergy their wealth or rights, now by the seductions of money and power, forced or filched from them by reluctant or by willing cession, the sacred inheritance they were bound to hold and to transmit for God and for His poor, but not for themselves. The very focus and centre of all this

* Matt. xviii. 18, 21 ; xxii. 21. Rom. xiii. 17. 1 Tim. ii. 2. 1 Pet. ii. 13. Etc. etc.

evil was the practice of the investiture of bishops and other clerics by the civil power. As long as this continued there was no human prospect of any general or abiding cure for the evils under which Christendom was labouring when S. Gregory ascended the throne of S. Peter. His pontificate, therefore, was one continued, uniform struggle to put down this inveterate abuse; and as he himself confessed with dying lips, he purchased the freedom of God's Church with his life itself. Acclaimed by the popular voice, in spite of his resistance, at S. Peter's, proclaimed in S. John Lateran by both clergy and people as the only free choice of the Church, and canonically elected by the Cardinals in the Eudoxian Basilica of S. Peter ad Vincula,* S. Gregory, then sixty years of age, grave of aspect, small of stature, but resolute and hardy, took the helm of S. Peter's barque when the whole air and wide waters of human society seemed fullest of menace and of danger to every interest of which the Church is the only sufficient guardian. It is remarkable that the new Pope, though he was the champion of free election as against the abuse of an independent Imperial nomination to the See of Peter, nevertheless notified his election to the Emperor, and received his envoy, Gregory, Chancellor of the kingdom of Italy and Bishop of Vercelli, on the occasion of his consecration in S. Peter's.† Whatever else may be concluded from this fact, surely it shows that there was no disposition on his part to go beyond what was necessary in his attitude towards Henry. That his conciliatory action in this matter was not considered a reversal of his policy during the years of his administration as Cardinal first-deacon, is plain, for Henry, seconded by bishops who had reason to fear the consequences of the election of a reforming Pope, sent an envoy to remonstrate on the election as irregular, because not first sanctioned by him. The Pope received him with honour, represented the true state of the case, that his election by both clergy and people was entirely spontaneous; that his own reluctance was known to all, and that the subsequent action of the Conclave was free and unfettered; nor did he refuse the ratification of the Emperor and the consequent provision made by him through another ambassador for the ceremonies of the Pope's exaltation. This, as an external act, came under the control of the civil power, for the Emperor was, as such, the legitimate supreme suzerain of Italy. S. Gregory's conciliating policy went further; for, whereas he sent his legates to Spain

* Baronius, An. 1074, No. 24, and Lab., tom. x. p. 7.

† S. Gregory was the first Pope who, being a deacon, was ordained priest before his episcopal consecration. The episcopate being the fulness of the priesthood, this was not necessary.

with instructions to speak in terms of the utmost liberty and authority, and wrote with apostolic severity to the Gallic Bishops; he addressed himself as regards Henry to obtain the mediation of his princes, and in tones of paternal persuasion. Henry's answer was so complete a repudiation of all his previous malpractices and profession of entire amendment for the future, that critics have doubted its authenticity. But when we consider the character of this prince, impulsive, inconstant, and wayward to an extraordinary degree, his need of the support of the Church in his struggle with the Saxons and Thuringians, and the just reputation of the new Pope for wisdom and energy, there seems no reason to doubt that this document is genuine. The Emperor had provoked those provinces by his cruelties to a resistance which issued in his being besieged in the fortress of Harzburg; and then, having deceived all by feigned negotiations, he fled secretly, leaving his supporters to curse his duplicity hardly less heartily than did his foes. The consequent assembly of the princes of the Empire at the Diet of Gerstungen, their declaration that Henry was unfit to reign by his cruelty, crimes, and unfaithfulness to his royal word, are matters of history not directly relevant to our present scope, save as showing conclusively what Henry was, and so justifying the Pope's subsequent treatment of him as a prince on whose word no reliance could be placed. Meanwhile S. Gregory, by actions which it is not necessary to detail, had relieved the Church both in south and north Italy, and in Sardinia, from the abusive dependence on the civil power under which she had so long laboured, and by alliances with powerful princes paved the way for the great struggle with the Empire which he saw to be inevitable.

Both in France and in Germany, he preluded for the encounter, by checking the perjured and simoniacal proceedings of King Philip, and by secret understanding with Henry's rival, Rodolph of Rheinfelden. This prince, Duke of Suabia, and of the province of Burgundy, on the German side of the Jura, was already secretly chosen as future Emperor by the princes at Gerstungen. Before this, or at this very time, S. Gregory had interposed his good offices to reconcile the Saxons to the Emperor, but in vain. Henry believing himself strong enough to compel them to allegiance, but finding little support among his feudatories, was constrained at last by them to swear that he would observe faithfully the humiliating conditions he had accepted from the Diet. To him the Pope addressed himself, not only by Legates, but by his mother the Empress Agnes, then resident in Rome, imploring him to allow what he had promised before, to take effect, viz., the canonical deposition of bishops

convicted in synod of simony, and the deprivation and censure of concubinary priests till they should give up their way of life. This, he again promised to do. Meanwhile, though labouring under a severe malady, the Pope had by repeated Synods and decrees, purged the Italian peninsula and various provinces north of the Alps of some of the worst corruptions, and in February, 1075, assembled a Council at Rome. At this, the final abolition, under pain of excommunication, of the secular investiture of clerics by any form under any pretext whatever, was decreed by the Pope and Fathers, gathered from all parts—and even the most remote—of Europe, for the express purpose of this enactment. But, between the provisions of this Synod and the carrying them out, there lay barriers, which, to human eyes, seemed utterly insurmountable. His victory over the Saxons, at Hohenburg, and other successes, once more gave the Emperor occasion for an elation, of which the immediate results were his evasion of all his engagements to his subjects and to the Church. The Church of Milan was already molested by a schism, at the head of which was Henry's simoniacal and intrusive protégé Gottfried, but encouraged by the most rebellious Milanese, who had massacred the Pope's envoy, the lawful Archbishop's defender, Ernembald, he now nominated a third, by name Tedaldus, whom the Pope warned not to accept the See, while its lawful occupant lived. At this very time he sent special envoys to Rome, with hypocritical declarations of submission, and pretended confidences with his mother Agnes, and the Countesses Beatrice and Matilda of Tuscany. These princesses, however, were aware, as was the Pope, that the Emperor was not to be trusted, and was only waiting for the settlement of his civil wars to make an open breach with him. The same treachery as had disgraced him the year before, was once more manifested by Henry, when he had secured by false professions of clemency the submission of the Saxons, for he subjected them to all the horrors which a conquering and implacable army resisted to the utmost, might have inflicted. He then retired to Worms, which was to be the scene of a series of scandalous outrages on religion. The prolonged vacancy of the great See of Bamberg, from which Henry's favourite Herman had been deposed for simony, was, at last, unwillingly filled by the Emperor by the nomination of Rupert, a man of great sagacity, but the minister of many unpopular acts; and both this See and the most important abbacies of Fulda and Lorch, were conferred by Henry, with the forbidden investiture, "*per baculum et annulum.*" It is fair to say that these dignities were not sold to the bidders who infested his court, but, on the other hand, the general tenor of his conduct justly renders

these exceptions matter for suspicion as to his motives in departing from his usual habit. The evidence of several writers tends to show that he was perfectly aware of the nefarious conspiracy against S. Gregory, of Gilbert Correggia, Archbishop of Ravenna, afterwards anti-Pope, under the name of Clement III. Suborned by him and other concubinary and simoniacal bishops and prelates, Cercio, a Roman whose violence and exactions had made him the Pope's enemy, attempted the life of S. Gregory, as he was officiating on the vigil of Christmas, 1075, in the chapel of the Sacred Crib, at S. Mary Major's. Outraged, stripped of his vestments, buffeted and wounded in the forehead, the Pontiff was dragged from the altar, with the intent of either putting him to death or handing him over a prisoner to the Emperor. The Roman people no sooner knew what had occurred (for a severe frost had prevented the usual concourse to the Papal midnight mass), than they rushed to his rescue, and Cercio seeing his palace surrounded and the wall broken through, threw himself at S. Gregory's feet, and implored a pardon, which the magnanimous Pope freely conceded, on the condition, which he never fulfilled, of a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. The prime mover of these atrocities, Correggia, withdrew to the north of Italy to continue his intrigues and to unite his adherents to those of Tedaldus of Milan, and form alliances with Robert Guiscard and the Emperor against the Pope. Undaunted and constant in his high purpose, the Pope continued his career. The Emperor appealed to him to excommunicate the Saxon bishops as rebels and aiders of rebellion. The Saxons, on their side, equally appealed to him as the only adequate judge between them and their sovereign. The Pope again and again warned the Emperor that his violence and treachery would meet with their just punishment, and implored him to remedy the evils which rent his empire, and the Churches of Saxony especially. At the Diet of Goslar, Henry once more conciliated the Saxons by liberating their chiefs and making one of them his counsellor, with a view to securing their aid against the Pope. Meanwhile, the Papal Legates, after reminding him of the threats of excommunication which the Pope had renewed, in letters, during the early part of 1076, cited Henry, in his name, to appear before the Council of Rome, to answer and purge himself from the accusations brought against him by the Saxon and Thuringian princes and people; and this under pain of being declared a rebel, and lapsed from communion with the Church of God. The answer was an explosion of rage and the instant expulsion of the Legates. Henry then summoned all his satellites to Worms, where he speedily appeared with considerable forces. Among the assembled

princes were several notorious excommunicated enemies of the Holy See, especially Cardinal Ugo Candido. This talented but shifty and unprincipled man, was made Cardinal by S. Leo IX., but excommunicated and deposed by Nicholas II., Alexander II., and S. Gregory, from whom he had received favours, and to whom he had, at the beginning of his Pontificate, rendered good service. Ugo, who was now the accomplice of Guilbert of Ravenna, aided by Sigefried of Mayence, rose in the midst of the assembly, numbering some twenty-four bishops among them, and produced a libel, in which the most disgraceful and entirely incredible and unfounded accusations of misconduct, immorality, ambition, and simony were launched against the Pope. Henry knew him too well to believe them, but he was content to let them serve as the ground on which, after three days' deliberation, it was resolved to attack the Pope, and by force of arms to depose him as simoniacal. In spite of the remonstrances of the minority, this document was signed first by the King and then by the princes and prelates, his adherents, and embassies were directly sent off to the Lombard and other northern Italian factors of schism and disorder to ask their adhesion. At a meeting of these worthies, at Pavia, they not only adhered to the act, but swore never to obey the Pontiff deposed at Worms. Henry also despatched rich presents to bribe the Roman people, with letters, in which he addressed himself to "Hildebrand," as he styled the Pope, enclosed a copy of the deposition, signed at Worms, and pronounced him fallen from the Papacy, in the following words:—"I declare thee fallen from all the rights of Pope, which thou hast usurped, and I command thee to come down from that See of Rome, of which the free suffrages of the people have made me Patrician and King." With this was also published a letter, in which he called on the Roman Senate and people to condemn and tear Hildebrand from his throne as a tyrant, a usurper of the See, traitor to the Roman Empire, and conspirator against the commonweal and against his own. Roland, an unworthy priest of Parma, undertook to deliver these insolent missives, and entering the Council in the Vatican, at which the Pope, seated on his throne, was presiding, he inveighed against him, and called on him to descend from his usurped throne, which none could lawfully occupy, unless elected by all the faithful bishops, and confirmed by the Patrician of Rome. Then, turning to the clergy, he cited them to appear at Pentecost, before Henry IV., to receive at his hands a new Pope; for that Hildebrand was a wolf and a tyrant. With one consent, all rushed upon this insolent messenger, who would have certainly expiated his

crime with his life; but that the Pope, covering him with his own person, implored them to shed no blood, but to wait for and endure persecution, if such were God's will. Then, opening the king's letter, he read it with an astonishing calmness and serenity. The letter bore, "Henry, not by usurpation, but by the will of God, King of Germany, to Hildebrand, not Pope, but a false monk." The Pope's gentleness and prudence in adjourning the Council till the next day, again saved the life of the messenger, when the letters were read. The next day he spoke with great moderation and indulgence of the king, persuading him to set free the bishops and abbots whom he held in prison; but, after he had finished speaking, the unanimous voice of the Council, containing more than 100 bishops, was, that the Pope should excommunicate Henry, King of Germany, and Roman Emperor.

Then, rising, S. Gregory condemned and anathematized the king. "Firm," he said, "in the confidence that the Vicar of Christ can bind and loose here below that which is to be bound or loosed in heaven, and not trusting in human counsel, but for the safety and honour of the Church, I, lawful Pope and true Lieutenant of God, excommunicate, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, Henry, King of Germany, son of Henry, Emperor of the Romans, who, with unheard-of pride persecutes and opposes the Church; I interdict him from the government of Germany and of Italy; I absolve all Christians from the oath they have given or shall give him, and I forbid all and every one in future to obey him as king, for he that disobeys the Church loses the authority which he receives from the Church." He then excommunicated all the schismatical bishops and other fautors of schism at Pavia, renewed the censures of some and cited others to appear before his supreme tribunal.*

The Pope followed up this act by letters to all the princes and bishops of the empire, in which he explained the motives of his action. None, even of the partisans of Henry, contested his right to excommunicate; what they alleged was that it was premature and irregular to do so before he had been accused, tried, and judged. Henry was at Utrecht with the excommunicated William, Archbishop of that See, when he received the news of his excommunication, and was greatly cast down by it till encouraged by the archbishop. On Easter-day this prelate preached a violent invective against S. Gregory, ridiculing the excommunication. He was immediately seized with horrible

* Baronius assigns to this epoch the so-called "Dictatus Papæ," twenty-seven sentences or maxims, which sum up the principles on which this great Pope acted.

pains, and died in agony and remorse, imploring the bystanders to tell Henry and his followers that they should avoid his fate by a timely repentance. A series of judgments fell on other of the chief adherents of the king at this time, and contributed not a little, as similar facts are now doing in Italy, to impress the minds of many with a terror such as that which ensued on the deaths of Ananias and Sapphira.* Various prelates and princes returned by submission to the communion of the Church, and those who had prisoners hastened to open their doors, and let clerics and others whom the king had delivered to their charge go free. Returning to their homes in Saxony, they found their land a prey to the most grinding tyranny, and, determined to free it, re-established the Saxon league, and soon gained to their side many princes of note, and some of Henry's most trusted allies and dependants. Once more he had recourse to promises of clemency, and summoned in vain Diets both at Worms and at Mainz; but the Saxons no longer yielded belief to a royal word so often broken, and no one attended the Diets. The Saxon princes then consulted the Pope, whether it was lawful for them to elect another supreme lord over the empire. The Pope's answer was, that though Henry's conduct justified such an act, he still counselled mercy rather than justice, and exhorted them to use all means short of this extreme measure to induce him to repent of his misgovernment. If he listened to their remonstrances, and gave guarantees of amended conduct, the Pope desired they should at once let him know, that he might then summon a Council to deliberate on what was to be done for the good of the empire and his own. Meanwhile absolution was strictly reserved to the Holy See, and if he should continue hardened, the Pope declared that it would be necessary that they should elect another and fitting emperor, who should promise and swear due submission to the Holy See, and give proper guarantees of the same. Such a prince, he says, might then receive the confirmation of his right and authority which no other than the Pope can give. The feudatories of the empire assembled at Ulm in consequence of this letter, and thence (after long counsel) despatched a summons to all who had a right to meet in Diet at Triburg, on the 15th of October, 1076, to remedy the evils of the State, and give peace to the afflicted Churches. Henry's followers, already reduced, were terrified at this summons, and during the ensuing months many deserted his cause, and claimed the Pope's mercy and absolution, which was readily extended to them. Count Everard (surnamed his "shadow") seems now to have been the

* Acts v. 11.

only feudatory who remained with Henry. The others came to the Diet armed and followed by bodies of troops, and determined to elect another emperor. The Papal Legates first reconciled all that needed absolution, and the Diet proceeded to elect with extraordinary unanimity the prince whom they wished to succeed Henry. He, in the meanwhile, from his retreat at Oppenheim, sent daily messengers, imploring the princes to spare him, and offering every possible guarantee, and the cession of all his prerogatives except the bare title and insignia of royalty, inherited from his father. The princes answered, that they had too long experienced the king's bad faith and treachery to trust him, that their compliances had been fatal to the interests of the empire, and that as an excommunicate person they would hold no intercourse with him. Moreover, their choice had already been fixed, after seven days' deliberation, on another prince, who would take the side which their consciences commended to them as that of justice and right. Henry then summoned all the troops at his command to Oppenheim, and prepared to make a desperate attack on the princes, in which he should conquer or perish. Upon this they thought it prudent to send him a deputation with conditions for peace, of which the chief was his written promise to abide by the decision of the Pope, whom they invited to a Diet at Augsburg, for the purpose of adjudicating between him and them; that he should plead guilty to the charge of tyranny exercised upon the Saxons and Suabians, that he should purge his court of abandoned women, libertines, and excommunicated persons, retire into private life under the care of the Bishop of Verdun and other ecclesiastics; not interfere in public affairs, or wear the insignia of royalty, until duly absolved; and should dismiss his troops and the garrisons of the Imperial cities.

After some resistance, Henry acceded to these humiliating terms, and retired, accompanied only by his injured wife and son, to the neighbourhood of Spires. A writer whom we have already quoted, more for the gravity of his style than for the accuracy of his information, affirms that "in the opinion of that period and of all subsequent ages," the Emperor's submission at Canossa was on the part of the Pope "the most outrageous act of the most domineering of Popes."* This view, as we see, was not the view of the whole feudatories of the Germanic empire, assembled to force their feudal head to submit to it. We venture to say that such an exception to the "opinion of that period," as that of all concerned most nearly in the event, is a very considerable exception.

* *Times*, as above.

The princes had despatched an embassy to the Pope to inform him of what had passed at the Diet of Triburg, and to beg him to come in person to the general Diet of all German and Italian feudatories, in the ensuing October. S. Gregory, consenting to this proposal, left Rome for the north, and had reached Vercelli, on the southern slope of the Alps, when warned that there was reason to apprehend an armed descent of the Emperor upon Italy, he retired into the stronghold of Canossa, a castle of the Countess Matilda, as Margravine of Tuscany, escorted (as he had been from Rome) by that princess and her guards.

Meanwhile, Henry became weary of his isolation. He saw no hope of recovering the allegiance of his feudatories, except through submitting to the Pope, and thus obtaining his absolution before the expiration of the period fixed by the laws of the empire as that after which his return to power would become impossible. Suddenly and privately, therefore, he left Spire, and, making a wide circuit, crossed the Alps in the depth of the winter. By Turin, Piacenza, and Reggio, he reached Canossa, attracting to him as he went the disaffected and irregular of northern Italy, who saw in him their champion against the Pope. On the other hand, his sudden disappearance from Germany struck dismay into his few remaining adherents there, and many of them, especially bishops and other ecclesiastics, found their way as penitents and pilgrims to seek absolution at Rome, and even at Canossa. To all the Pope showed himself gentle and forgiving, imposing on them salutary penance, and dismissing them, forgiven and assoiled, to their homes and places. And now, at length, to Canossa.

Fancy sketches and fine writing apart, the interview happened after the following sort. Henry had despatched envoys to the Pope as soon as he was safe over the Alps to set forth his object in coming; and when near the fortress he sent to beg his kinswoman, the countess Matilda, to come to him at the inn. Azzo, Marquis of Este, and head of the house of Brunswick and of Guelph, Hugh, abbot of Cluny, Henry's godfather, and various other princes and prelates of the Pope's court and following, went with her, and this was in itself a mark of Papal clemency, for certainly this visit to the excommunicated sovereign was made with his sanction. The king handed to Matilda a written plea for the Pope; in which he implored absolution, and begged him not to credit the allegations of his enemies. To this the Pope returned answer by the countess, that the laws of the Church did not allow judgment, and least of all absolution, of kings, such as he was, to be passed in the absence of the accusers; that if his conscience acquitted him he could well await the decision which the Pope had consented to award at

the Diet at Augsburg, and that he knew he had no cause to fear the equity and clemency of his judgment. To this he pleaded, that the time was too near when, if he were still excommunicate, the Imperial laws would deprive him for ever of his dignity; and that if the Pope would absolve him in this his great strait he would give him every guarantee and assurance of amendment in the future. Finally, the Pope yielded to his entreaties, and the intercessions which all about him made for the humbled sovereign; but he stipulated for certain external marks of that repentance which, against his convictions and experience of the prince, his charity made him hope was a real and abiding resipiscence. For three days he stood a suppliant in the third court of the castle. He wore the habit of penitents at that time, of a white woollen material, and he was barefoot, in the sense probably that the barefooted Capuchin or Carmelite is so, viz., he wore the rough sandal of the Italian peasant of that time. We venture thus to harmonize the varying accounts of contemporary and later writers. On the third day the Pope yielded to his supplications and the intercession of the countess, and Hugh of Cluny, and raised the excommunication, and Henry was admitted to his presence. His feet being chapped with the cold, the Pope hastened his absolution by some stipulations conveyed by word of mouth. The chief were that he should appear at the Diet of his German fiefs; that the Pope should there be the sole and final judge between him and his accusers; that if acquitted he should retain the crown, if the reverse, he should resign it without strife, nor in any event take vengeance of the princes or bishops who had accused him; that he should not wear the royal insignia in the interim, should exact only enough of the royal dues to maintain himself and his family according to their rank, and should dismiss evil counsellors and companions, and swear inviolable allegiance to the Apostolic See, and the correction of all abuses, and especially those of simony and lay investiture. Further, that if he failed in any of these conditions the absolution should, *ipso facto*, become void, and his subjects freed from their allegiance to him, should lawfully elect another prince to rule over them. Henry accepted all; and professing a religious veneration for the sanctity of his oath, swore on the Gospels to observe them. The Pope, however, was not satisfied to admit him to the communion of the Church until Hugh of Cluny, the Bishop of Vercelli, Eppo of Zeitz, and Azzo of Este, and other Italian and German princes had made themselves sureties for his observance of his oath. S. Gregory then gave him his blessing, and received him to the kiss of peace, and forthwith celebrated the Holy Mass. At the Communion he turned

round, and causing the Emperor to approach, held in his hand the Sacred Eucharistic Body of the Lord, and with loud voice declared his innocence of the crimes laid to his charge by Henry and his other enemies, and called on God to attest his truth, by visiting him if he spoke falsely with instant death, when he received this divine Sacrament. Acclamations of religious joy greeted these words, and then the Pope turning to Henry called on him to do the same, and thus purge himself of the crimes laid to his charge if his conscience allowed him. But Henry, pale and trembling, excused himself by saying that he wished to accept this test only at the Diet, not then. Mass over, the Pope invited the Emperor to his table, and having refreshed him with food and with salutary counsel, gave him the salutation, "Vade in pace," and accompanied him to the threshold of the palace. He sent the Bishop Eppo to the outer court to absolve the Emperor's followers; but these, both Italians and Germans, broke out into invectives against the Pope and the Emperor also, and declared they would elect his son in his stead, and force S. Gregory to abdicate. On the sixth day after his departure he reached Reggio, and was received with insolent reproaches by the Lombard schismatical bishops, headed by Guilbert of Ravenna. Yielding to their threats, and in hope of preserving his Italian states, he consented once more to revolt against the Pope, and entered on engagements then and there to seize his person and name an anti-Pope! From Bibianello he sent messengers to the Holy Father imploring another interview at any place north of the Po, in company of the princes of North Italy. The Pope consented, and set out from Canossa. He had crossed the frontier of Lombardy (and some say met Henry and conferred again with him) when the Countess Matilda, his watchful guardian, learning by her scouts certain signs of treachery, by a sudden retrograde movement through mountain-passes and by-ways, retired with the Pope in safety to Canossa. This check prevented him from proceeding northward to the Diet, and Henry throwing off the mask, which he had worn for a whole week, declared war against the Pope, and summoned to his aid all the schismatics and disaffected of the peninsula. Meanwhile the Saxon party in Germany proceeded at the Diet, transferred from Ulm to Fuchheim, to elect Rodolph, Duke of Suabia, King and Emperor. When the Pope's Legates had done their utmost to persuade the feudatories to defer the election till the Pope could either come to the Diet, or be again consulted, they at length yielded and sanctioned the election. It appears from S. Gregory's letters that in so doing they exceeded their instructions, and that in spite of all that had passed, the

magnanimous Pontiff was desirous not to proceed to extremities against Henry. He declared by an encyclical that he had neither hand nor counsel with the electors of Rodolph, and though he could not but sympathize with their objects, he disapproved of Rodolph's conduct in allowing himself to be elected, at least prematurely.

It is not our purpose to write a biography of S. Gregory; we have here attempted a sketch of the state of society and of the events which led to the meeting of Pope and Emperor at Canossa. The rest of S. Gregory's pontificate was of a piece with the first four years of it. Henry's violation of his engagements whenever he thought himself strong enough to violate it with impunity or advantage, the rending of the whole Empire in Germany and Italy by the contending factions of Guelphs and Ghibellines, the Pope's continued efforts by Councils and Diets to reduce the chaos of civil and religious discord to order, his energetic extirpation of simony and immorality among the clergy of France, of the Spanish kingdoms, and England; the descent of Henry into Italy in 1081, and his siege of Rome during two years; his return for the fourth time in 1084, when he was crowned by the anti-Pope Guilbert of Ravenna, in S. Peter's, the siege of the Castle of S. Angelo, to which the Pope had retired, his release by Robert Guiscard, and his retreat to Salerno, all these events were the sequel of the gigantic strife in which S. Gregory engaged for the Church of God. Early in 1085 his bodily strength began to fail, and by April he was unable to rise from his bed. Feeling his end at hand, he called around him his faithful cardinals and bishops, and when asked by them whom they should elect to succeed him in such troublous times, he named three: Hugh, Archbishop of Lyons; Otteo, Bishop of Ostia, afterwards Urban II.; and Desiderius, Archbishop of Monte Cassino, who succeeded him as Victor III. Thus did this great Pontiff, who had actively concurred in the election of five of his predecessors, securing to the Church a continuance of one and the same lofty and intelligent policy, protract his salutary influence beyond the grave, and leave worthy successors to carry on his admirable work. To the prayer that he would absolve the excommunicated persons, he said, "Excluding Henry, whom they call king, and Guilbert, usurper of the Holy See, and all who by word or deed favour the impiety of either, I give to all who believe and confess that I am the true Vicar of Christ, and successor of Peter, pardon and grace." Then, after wise and salutary counsels to his bishops, he said in solemn tones: "In the name of Almighty God, and in the strength of the Apostles, Peter and Paul, protectors of the Roman Church, I teach you a holy

doctrine: hold for a false Pope him who is not elected, consecrated, and exalted according to the holy Canons." At last, feeling the call of God—his dying words were, "I have loved justice and have hated iniquity, and for this I die in exile." One near him said, "Lord, thou canst not die in exile, for thou art the Vicar of Christ, who gave thee His people for thine inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for thy possession"; but his spirit had fled, and the measure of his stewardship was filled up. His death took place on the 25th of May, 1085, and he was buried in the Cathedral of Salerno, but lately consecrated by himself in honour of the Assumption and of S. Matthew, whose body lies there also. In 1573, after the lapse of nearly five centuries, the Bishop of Salerno, Marsigli Colonna, opened the tomb, and his remains were seen almost incorrupt, and clad in pontifical vestments. A few years later his name was enrolled in the Roman Martyrology; his office, inserted in the Breviary by Paul V., was extended by other Popes to many parts of the Church, and finally the Venerable Benedict XIII. canonized him, *per equipollentiam*, as it is called, that is by extending the use of his office and mass by precept, to the whole Church, in 1729.

Henry, too, was to die; and, alas! how differently. Deserted, stripped by his own son, with ignominy, of the Imperial robes, a fugitive from the prison to which his child had consigned him, an exile, but not for justice sake, invoking God's curse on his ungrateful son, he died as he had lived, excommunicate. The irony of events could surely hardly be pushed beyond that turn of fortune which brought Henry's rebellious son to the feet of Pope Pascal II. at Rome, two years after his father's death, begging leave from S. Gregory's successor to remove his dishonoured body from the cellar in which it had lain, because he died under the Church's ban.* But now to conclude with some few reflections suggested by what we have written.

First, we would observe that the interview of Canossa was clearly a culmination of a series of events which had gone before. It is hardly too much to say that the modern popular view, which is a *watered down* edition of that of the French infidel writers of the last age, affects to believe that, whereas Pope and Emperor were living in mutual amity and goodwill, suddenly the Pope, forgetful of all his obligations, turned upon his inoffensive correlative the secular head of the Christian commonwealth, and, with intolerable arrogance and ambition, tried to put him down and trample on his undoubted rights. No doubt the miserable ages ("leaden centuries," as Baronius

* Guilbert also died impenitent at Aquileia in 1101.

styles them), from which society was emerging, had depraved the ministers of religion; this is allowed on all hands, and their culpable connivance in the usurpations of the State in the matter of simony and investiture especially, gave colour to this view; for, abuses which have become both general and inveterate, put on the name and claim the authority of use and custom, those guardians of right and peace against the rashness and unrest and licence of experiment. But, if ever a state of the Church and of society could be estimated by the test of the Divine wisdom, "by their fruits you shall know them," the condition of Christian Europe, when Hildebrand returned to Rome, bore irrefragable evidence that there were in the *status quo*, causes of social disorder and diseases of the body-politic calling for a change, as radical as it was to be universal. So far as there was peace between Pope and Kaiser, Princes and Bishops, clergy and laity, it was a "pax mala," and the first condition of improvement was that such a peace should be broken. No one, we suppose, except, perhaps, those who would rejoice if they could see the promises of Revelation visibly fail, could have wished to see things continue in the ordure of corruption and sacrilege, which defiled so large a portion of God's heritage. It follows surely from this, that those who resent and inveigh against the conduct of S. Gregory VII. must, in truth, be aiming their censure, not at the results, but at the methods of his warfare; we say this, because what in fact was his object but that of securing the ascendancy of the spirit over the sense, of moral over physical force, of law and order over the arbitrary and the violent? Well, then, let us join issue on this minor question, and see what the objections of critics amount to.

We suppose they would say that S. Gregory's fault, or crime, lay in the character of his pretensions and in his mode of asserting them. What were his pretensions? He pretended an authority more than human; but, be it observed, an authority, not personal to himself, in the sense of being a natural gift, or endowment of his own. On the contrary, he claimed that his authority was an express delegation of Christ's own power, and he pointed, as all his predecessors up to Peter, and all his successors down to Leo XIII., have done, to chapter and verse in the Divine Scriptures for the warrant of his claims. For a non-Catholic of this nineteenth century to say, "I do not believe in the Catholic doctrine," or even, "many or most did not believe it then; and, therefore, S. Gregory was wrong in advancing his claim to obedience on this ground," is simply puerile. The question is, did S. Gregory believe it? His whole life before he was Pope and after he was Pope, and his dying

words, attest it. Nay! more—we maintain that neither his claim to obedience, nor its success, so far as it did succeed, nor its failure, so far as it failed, can be accounted for, except on the hypothesis that it was *both* his own intimate conviction, and the profound persuasion of the age in which he lived, as it is now that of the overwhelming majority of Christians.

For, what were the chief factors in this mighty strife? The three enemies of S. Gregory and the three allies of Henry IV. were identical, viz., the world, the flesh, and the devil. Ambition, sensuality, and malice were the characteristics of his enemies, and on one or all of these were founded the immense evils which he spent his whole life in redressing. Let his adversaries point to one instance of these vices in his own career, or that of his friends and adherents. They are driven to seek accusations, not from the patent records of history and the annals of Church and State, but to the libels of such writers as Beuno, the pseudo-Cardinal of an infamous anti-Pope, whose writings, fished up and re-furbished by German curials of the seventeenth century, have been the stock reference of erastianism for the last three centuries. As Sarpi is to the Council of Trent, or Pomponio Leto to that of the Vatican, so is Beuno to S. Gregory VII.

Well, then we are told that his language was violent, and his measures extreme. To call things by their names and to tell even kings or popular assemblies, as the case may be (for the Pope is eternal, and his voice gives no varying or uncertain sound, and it is not the Church, but the State which waxes and wanes as the moon), to tell people, we say, *home* (and, therefore, unpleasant) truths, may be disagreeable to those concerned, but it is not “violent,” unless it is undeserved, which is the very point at issue. As to the extremity of his measures, this may either mean what is true, that the evils he had to attack were extreme, and his war with them, therefore, internecine; or, it may mean, that they were excessive and so disproportioned to those evils, or unwisely precipitate. As to the first of these objections, we will appeal to a witness, who, from his hostility to the Papal See and its pretensions, is certainly not prejudiced on the Pope’s side.* He says, speaking of Henry III.’s declara-

* It is curious, and to our mind encouraging, to notice how the historical knowledge of this century has developed. Villemain certainly passed for a historian of mark twenty or thirty years ago. We find his work full of inaccuracies and mistakes, which a mere tyro now would detect. As a specimen, take the following. He is speaking of the Roman Church and its clergy, and cites S. Jerome’s invectives against the practical corruptions of his times. Then, he adds:—“It is remarkable that this same Saint, though attached to the faith of the Roman Church, and even, during a long time, secretary to Pope Damasus, did not admit the supremacy of the Roman

tion at Constance, that the purchase of preferment for money was in itself sufficient cause for the exclusion of the purchasers from all exercise of ecclesiastical functions. "Henry III.," he says, "endeavoured to parry the attack, which he foresaw the Church of Rome would make, by bringing an accusation against priests and laymen in common, stigmatizing the abuse of the right which he desired to retain in his own hands; but, in the then state of society, it is plain that the right and the abuse of it were inseparable, as long as the right remained in secular hands. In order to put an end to the sale of benefices and the accompanying corruption of the clergy, it was absolutely necessary to deprive temporal princes of the right of investiture." Such is the opinion of Villemain.* We will only ask how could that be a "right," which it was the bounden duty of the Church utterly to abolish? No: The Church never abolishes

Pontiff, 'if we seek authority,' says he, 'the universe ought to prevail over a city. Wherever one is a Bishop, be it at Rome or at Eugubium, at Constantinople or Rhegium, Alexandria or Thonis, he is of the same merit, of the same priesthood.' Such were the ideas of the fourth century." (Villemain's "History of Gregory VII.," vol. i. p. 53. English ed. 1874.) Now, as S. Jerome's statement of his belief on this point naturally occurs to the mind of any smatterer in ecclesiastical history, so astonishing an allegation as Villemain's attracted our attention, and we looked up the passage (which Villemain, by-the-way, cites inaccurately) in his "Epistle ad Evangelicum" (No. 146, in Vallart's edition). It appears that one Falcidius had been exalting the office of deacons as compared with priests, and rested his argument on the position held at Rome by the deacons, of whom there were but seven, whereas the priests were forty or fifty; these deacons held high and influential offices, as the Cardinal Deacons do now, and the first deacon for many ages was usually the Pope's factotum, or prime minister, as we should now say, and S. Jerome, in the passage from which the above words are cited, ridicules the argument that the wealth and influence of those deacons lifted their order above the priesthood. To this passage, concluding as above, he adds:—"Potentia divitiarum et paupertatis humilitas vel sublimiorem vel inferiorem episcopum non facit. Cæterum omnes Apostolorum successores sunt." No doubt S. Jerome's style, trenchant and rapid, lends itself to mistakes and truncated quotations; but, if Villemain had the knowledge he pretends to, of S. Jerome's opinions and those of his century, about the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, he should have quoted a passage we all remember, on that precise topic, not an obiter dictum with another scope. We mean his fifty-ninth epistle to S. Damasus, Pope, where he says: "I, following none but Christ, as the first, am joined in communion with your Holiness, that is, with the Chair of Peter. Upon that Rock the Church, I know, is built. Whoever outside of this house eateth the lamb is profane. If any one is not in the Ark of Noah, he shall perish. I know not Vitalis; I reject Meletius; I ignore Paulinus. Whoever gathers not with Thee, scatters: *that is*, he who is not of Christ, is of anti-Christ." Such were the ideas of the fourth century; and such are ours now, in the nineteenth century.

* "History of Gregory VII.," vol. i. p. 258. English Translation (a very poor one).

rights; the so-called right was an abuse in itself, never tolerable, and then so intolerable that, as we see, the head of civil society himself was foremost to denounce it as menacing the very foundations of the commonwealth. What measures then could be excessive, when the safety of the commonwealth, which is the supreme law of its being, was at stake? But, further, they were not disproportioned, for the evils to be cured were universal and ever-recurring, and hence the Pope's action and the Pope's authority alone were adequate, because his action and his authority alone were co-extensive and co-ordinate with the mischief. The reign of simony and corruption in spiritual persons, is the substitution of the reign of Satan for that of Christ in the very throne of His kingdom, and when He, with his own Divine hands, made a scourge of cords to drive money-mongers, and even the sellers of things needed for the worship which He Himself had ordered, out of the sacred precincts of His House, He gave the example which His Vicars cease not to this hour to imitate.

Lastly, we said that not only S. Gregory's success, but even his partial failure, attested by his own dying words, is an evidence of the sincerity of his convictions, and of his enemies' consciousness of the truth of his belief. It is a most awful and terrible truth, but a most certain one, that the manifestation of supernatural truth, consciously opposed, elicits a hostility more than human. No one can read the history of the life and passion of our Divine Lord without seeing it written on every page; no one can look into his own inner life without seeing some pale reflection of this law, to say the least; and no one can read the history of the Church and her children, the Saints of God, without seeing it reproduced, again and again, with amazing vividness. The "hour of the enemies of Christ," and of the "powers of darkness," recurs from age to age, and he that "hinders is made manifest" by the very success of his opposition. This mark, and that other sign of the work of God, the opposition of some well-meaning and even good men, are inscribed on the pontificate of S. Gregory and in his whole working from first to last; and as his life was passed in most various circumstances, with a predominance of sorrow and suffering, so his death in exile, while it was in the eyes of the world, which knows no future state, the seal and consummation of failure, like to the death of his Lord on Calvary, or of Peter on Janiculum, in his own eyes was the sign that he had indeed loved justice and hated iniquity.

The writer whom we have cited says, "Rome never gives up an idea once in its mind." The idea in the mind of Rome is that might makes no right, that the souls of men are worth

more than matter, and that to suffer imprisonment and exile and death rather than sacrifice truth and justice, is a spectacle for men and for angels. S. Gregory at war with Henry IV., Pius VII. at war with Napoleon I., or Pius IX. at war with Victor Emmanuel and Prince Bismarck's Emperor, are all parts of the self-same "idea" in the mind of Rome; and to speak plainly, the pleas which half-hearted people make for S. Gregory—that his age was a rough one, and he had to deal with it as he found it, and the like, are altogether futile. What justifies all such struggles is the eternal principle involved in them, and the response it finds in the heart and conscience of upright men. The writer of the article we have already cited, ascribes S. Gregory's career to "pride, passion, mere love of triumph." But neither history nor common sense will accept so vulgar and inadequate a solution of the action of the Papacy during the eventful epoch of which we are writing. Villemain's appreciation of such great strifes as these, is worthier and more statesman-like. "Looking," he says,* "at the unity of each nation, and its right to be free from foreign domination, and looking, again, at a matter still more grave, the inviolability of conscience and of right against might, there never was resistance more just than the Pontiff's in his struggle with Henry; and as to the consequences of this resistance, and the frequent imitations of it furnished by the Middle Ages, we must admit they arose from a salutary principle, and were a safeguard to humanity. We have seen the truth of this in our own days so far removed from Christian simplicity, and in our own country, a prey to scepticism and to absolute power. When the rule of a conqueror oppressed Europe, from Rome to Hamburg, the first thrust which pierced his armour was from that superannuated weapon, the pontifical excommunication. The antiquated formula, "For these causes and by the authority of God Almighty, and the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul,"—this language, so scoffed at in the eighteenth century, and buried, as it were, under the ruins of the Church in France, coming suddenly from the lips of the Pope who had crowned Napoleon, was the first shock his power received. The bull of excommunication fastened on the doors of the Roman basilicas in the night of June 10, 1809, was the first and loudest tocsin that rang through Europe. He whom no power, human or divine, appeared to arrest in his course, was sensibly affected by the anathema issued by the old man who was his prisoner. He rushed from south to north in search of reprisals and victories, and fell furiously on the world; he multiplied his human sacrifices, but still the wound

* Vol. ii. p. 68.

rankled in his heart. Under this bull, uttered in language so long unheard—the voice, in fact, of justice and of the Divine law, he who had been the terror of mankind was crushed by the united forces of his adversaries and by the consequences of his own fury. Such is the lesson, moral and historic, which is read to us men of the nineteenth century by that Papal excommunication proclaimed in 1078, at the Council of Rome.” To these reflections we Englishmen should not omit to add that which Alison has recorded, that it was the Pope’s resistance to Napoleon’s continental system, and his refusal to close his ports of Ancona and Civita Vecchia to English ships, which was the immediate cause of the deportation and imprisonment of Pius VII. *This* was the same “idea in the mind of Rome,” the idea of right and justice, for which S. Gregory lived, and died in exile, and for which Pius IX. lived, and Leo XIII. lives at this moment, beleaguered in his own city. Fine writing apart, we are certain that even in the long and glorious roll of that sacred dynasty, the names of those Pontiffs who have suffered and acted for justice sake will shine with an increasing lustre as time shall clear away, with a slow but certain hand, the clouds of passion and of ignorance which too often shroud their true lineaments from our gaze. May this be—nay, is not this already?—the case with the great memory of S. Gregory VII., Pope and Confessor.

ART. VIII.—DR. BATEMAN ON DARWINISM.

On Aphasia or Loss of Speech, and the Localization of the Faculty of Articulate Language. By FREDERICK BATEMAN, M.D., &c. London : John Churchill & Sons. Norwich : Jarrold & Sons. 1870.

Darwinism Tested by Language. By FREDERICK BATEMAN, M.D., &c. With a Preface by EDWARD MEYRICK GOULBURN, D.D., Dean of Norwich. Rivingtons, Waterloo Place, London, Oxford, and Cambridge. Stacy, 2, Haymarket, Norwich. 1877.

WE notice the first of these two publications on account of the second. In "*Darwinism Tested by Language*," Dr. Bateman's essential argument is this : In addition to the other difficulties by which the theory of the bestial origin of man is beset, there is the fact, which has not sufficiently been taken into account, that man alone possesses the faculty of articulate and rational language. Parrots articulate, but do not use speech rationally ; they have the *materia* of language without the *forma*. No race of speechless men exists ; the instances alleged to the contrary are simply so many idle tales. The possession of language, therefore, constitutes a *difference in kind*, such as has been so often called for, between man and the lower animals.' "There is between the whole animal kingdom on one side, and man, even in his lowest state, on the other, a barrier which no animal has ever crossed, and that barrier is—*Language*. By no effort of the understanding, by no stretch of the imagination, can I explain to myself how language can have grown out of anything which animals possess, even if we granted them millions of years for that purpose. If anything has a right to the name of *specific difference*, it is language, as we find it in man, and in man only. Even if we removed the name of specific difference from our philosophic dictionaries, I should still hold that nothing deserves the name of man but what is able to speak."* But, if language were the consequence of the possession of a cerebral organ of language, found well developed in men, but absent or only rudimentary in the lower animals, this argument against evolutionism would fall to the ground ; for it might be said that the full possession of the faculty would follow on the perfect development of the organ.

* Max Muller, "Lectures on Mr. Darwin's Philosophy of Language," in "*Fraser's Magazine*," June, 1873, quoted in "*Darwinism Tested*," &c., pp. 102, 103.

The fact of the presence of a rudimentary language-organ would show the difference to be one of degree only, not of kind. Nor have attempts been wanting to localize the faculty of speech. Gall placed it in the orbital convolutions. Schroeder van der Kolk relegated it to the olivary bodies, which are most developed in man, occur only in the mammalia, and in apes resemble those of man. M. Bouillaud located it in the anterior lobes of the brain. More recently, however, he has admitted that aphasia may be caused by disease of the posterior lobes. M. Broca confined it to a particular portion of the left anterior lobe, the third left frontal convolution:—

The brain of man and that of apes, especially of the anthropoid apes (orang, chimpanzee, gorilla), are constructed absolutely upon the same type—a type by itself, and which is characterized, among other things, by the fissure of Sylvius, and by the manner in which the island of Reil is formed and covered; thus, in man, the third frontal convolution is extraordinarily developed, and covers partly the insula, while the transverse central convolutions are of much less importance. In the ape, on the other hand, the third frontal convolution is but slightly developed, while the central transverse convolutions are very large.

To show the bearing all this has upon the seat of speech, I would refer to the microcephali, who do not speak; they learn to repeat certain words like parrots, but they have no articulate [rational] language. Now, the microcephali have the same conformation of the third frontal convolution as apes; they are apes, as far as the anterior portion of their brain is concerned. Thus, man speaks; apes and microcephali do not speak. Certain observations have been recorded which seem to place language in the part which is developed in man, and contracted in the microcephali and in the ape; comparative anatomy, therefore, comes in aid of M. Broca's doctrine.—(Letter of Carl Vogt to Dr. Bateman, in "*Darwinism Tested*," pp. 144, 145.)

But Dr. Bateman, using the conclusions reached in his prior memoir on Aphasia, and adducing some of the instances there given, contends that M. Broca's theory—the opinions of Gall and Schroeder van der Kolk are now abandoned—is not substantiated by facts. Consequently, the argument that language constitutes a difference in kind between man and the lower animals, remains in its integrity:—

An impartial sifting of the mass of evidence I have accumulated, has led me to the following conclusions:—

First; that although something may be said in favour of each of the popular theories of the localization of speech, still, so many exceptions to each of them have been recorded, that they will none of them bear the test of a disinterested and impartial scrutiny.

Second; that I by no means consider it proved that there is a cerebral centre for speech at all, and I would venture to suggest that speech, like the

soul, may be something, the comprehension of which is beyond the limits of our finite minds.—("On Aphasia," p. 178.)

Dr. Bateman's two works, therefore, contain three things:—First, some general observations on the theory of transmutation, especially in the form of Darwinism; secondly, proofs that all men speak—all, that is, who are not disabled by accident, disease, or malformation—and that speech is peculiar to man; and thirdly, an investigation into the faculty of speech itself, and into its localization. What is said under the first of these three heads is too general; almost all of it might have been omitted without detracting from the essential merits of "Darwinism Tested," in the first eighty-six pages of which it is contained. Under the second head the author succeeds in proving that speechless races of men are mere imaginations; but, as this is not seriously contested, this portion of "Darwinism Tested" need not longer detain us. We turn, therefore, to the third head, and shall devote the remaining paragraphs of this notice to a brief discussion of two questions—What is the nature of the faculty of speech? and, What is to be thought of the various theories on its localization?

Dr. Bateman accepts, and we substantially accept with him, the distinctions promulgated by Professor Mivart, in an article in the "Quarterly Review," the substance of which is reproduced in the Fourth Chapter of "Lessons from Nature." "The essence of language," we are there told, "is mental—an intellectual activity called the *verbum mentale*; but actual "speech" itself is the outward expression of thoughts (rational conceptions) by articulate sounds—the *verbum oris*. We may have (1) animal sounds that are neither rational nor articulate; (2) sounds that are articulate, but not rational; (3) sounds that are rational, but not articulate; (4) sounds that are both rational and articulate; (5) gestures which do not answer to rational conceptions; and (6) gestures which do answer to such conceptions, and are, therefore, external, but non-oral manifestations of the *verbum mentale*. The fourth category is that of "true speech." It is, however, in itself a matter of indifference whether the signs by which the ideas are expressed are gestures or vocal sounds, although *per accidens*, the richness of combinations possible through articulation could not without some clumsiness and complexity, be imitated by a system of gestures. Whichever method of expression first offered itself would be adopted, whether by an intelligent or an unintelligent being. It is equally matter of indifference *in se* whether the sounds are articulate or inarticulate. Articulation is merely the breaking up of vowel sounds by explosives, sibilants, liquids, and the like (from which the vowel-sounds

differ only in degree), whereby a greater number and variety of sound-signs are obtained than would otherwise be possible. Many animals can utter more than a single vowel; many have one or more consonants in their vocabulary; and there would be no contradiction in the existence of an animal with a conformation of lips, tongue, teeth, and mouth and fauces, capable of pronouncing perfectly all the combinations of sounds of which our words are composed. We have in fact an approach to this in the parrot. All that can be said is, that probably a mere animal would not require, and would not be capable of appreciating the differences between such a complex system of sound-signs as we employ; and that therefore the complex sign-machinery, merely as such, affords indirect, though not direct evidence of the existence of higher than animal powers.

Any vocal-sound machinery, whether simple or complex, implies the existence of arrangements by which the sounds may be produced,—involves the possession of vocal organs. The working of these organs may become deranged in two ways. They, or their innervation, may suffer some gross and, as it were, palpable damage, by which they become incapable of executing at all the mandates of the executive faculty; the tongue is thickened, or the lips are paralyzed. The person affected cannot speak, because he cannot put the organs of articulation into motion. This is not aphasia. Neither is aphonia, in which, owing to some affection of the vocal chords, the patient can whisper, but cannot speak in a full voice, to be confounded with that malady. But there is a more subtle affection of the organs of voice, in which any single movement can be produced, but the movements cannot be combined, cannot be joined together in rapid succession, so as to produce those series of articulate sounds which we call speech. The patient can close and open his mouth, can move his tongue freely to any part of it, and can execute any required movements with his lips; but he cannot talk. The case is like that of a man who can move his fingers in any way he is requested to move them, but has suddenly become incapable of writing, or of shaving himself. His case is like that of a child who has not yet learnt to write or to shave, but has the full use of his hands for all general purposes; he knows the effect which he desires to produce, but lacks the dexterity to produce it; and the only difference is, that what the child had never acquired, the man has lost from accident or disease. The analogous affection of the executive organs of speech is one form of aphasia—the form from which Lord St. Leonards suffered. As the organs themselves are not necessarily injured, the malady must be due to defective innervation; it either passes away or

continues without further change, or is the prelude to more pronounced nervous disorders. We may, for the sake of clearness, call it *executive* or *motor aphasia*.

The first requisite, then, to a system of vocal signs is a certain condition of the vocal apparatus and its innervation; the second is the apprehension of the sounds which are to be produced. If this is wanting, the vocal organs cannot be directed in their emission, however healthy these organs may otherwise be. The existence of this second condition is of course precluded by congenital deafness; and even in the case of persons who have become deaf after they had learned to speak, we observe that the utterance gradually becomes indistinct and uncertain, as it becomes impossible to notice what are the sounds which are being emitted, or what mistakes are being made. A deaf parrot could never learn to speak. Speechlessness from deafness is not, however, aphasia. But just as a person may, from disease or other causes, become incapable of combining the articulatory movements while the organs of voice are uninjured, so he may become incapable of recalling the sound of the words without having first become deaf. This is a second form of aphasia, which we shall call *sensory aphasia*. It is merely an exaggeration of that condition, of not being able to find the right word, from which most persons have at some time or other suffered when in a state of extreme fatigue. In the one condition as in the other, the more familiar words are the last to go, and a patient will continue to say "Yes" and "No" after he has entirely lost the rest of his vocabulary. Precisely similar effects might no doubt be produced in a parrot by fatigue, senility, or cerebral disease.

These two points, however, are by no means all that are involved in the complex faculty of speech. For the ordinary use of language the ideas of the things which are represented by the words are also necessary. Dr. Bateman relates a curious case in which this condition seems to have been the one which was deficient:—

During a recent visit to La Salpêtrière, an institution at Paris for the reception of female patients, for the most part afflicted with some mental disorder, the physician, Dr. Auguste Voisin, knowing I was interested in the question of language, called my attention to the case of an old woman in whom the faculty of speech was entirely suspended, but who, although she never spoke, repeated like a parrot all that was said before her. For instance, Dr. Voisin addressed her thus:—"Voulez-vous manger aujourd'hui?" She said instantly, "Voulez-vous manger aujourd'hui?" I then said to her, "Quel âge avez-vous?" She replied, "Quel âge avez-vous?" I then said to her in English, "You are a bad woman." She instantly replied, "You are a bad woman." I said, "Sprechen sie Deutsch?" She

retorted, "Sprechen sie Deutsch?" In the words that she thus echoed her articulation was distinct, although the foreign phrases were not repeated by her in quite so intelligible a manner as the French. Not only did this woman echo all that was said, but she imitated every gesture of those around her. One of the pupils made a grimace; she instantly distorted her facial lineaments in precisely the same manner. Another pupil made the peculiar defiant action, common in schoolboys, of putting the thumb to the nose and extending all the fingers, called by the French *piéd de nez*. The patient instantly imitated this elegant performance. Just as we were leaving her bedside a patient in an adjoining bed coughed; the cough was instantly imitated by this human parrot! In fact, this singular old woman repeated everything that was said to her, whether in an interrogative form or not; and she imitated every act that was done before her, and that with the most extraordinary exactitude and precision.—("Darwinism Tested," pp. 108-110.)

This kind of aphasia—if aphasia it can properly be termed—might be called *Ideative aphasia*. While in the forms of the malady which have been mentioned above, the co-ordination of the vocal mechanism, or the sound-ideas, become deficient, while the ideas of things are unimpaired, here the ideas seem to have vanished, the two former conditions, or at least the first of them, remaining untouched. The state of things described appears somewhat to have resembled that which may reasonably be supposed to exist in the mind of a mocking-bird, which retains and automatically reproduces sounds heard by it, without entering into their signification. To a large extent, this must be the case also with parrots. It can scarcely be supposed that when a parrot says, "I am very glad to see you," or, "How are you this morning?" it apprehends at most more than a very small part, if even it apprehends any, of the meaning which according to common syntax and grammar is conveyed by these phrases. At the same time it must be admitted that certain ideas exist in the minds—using the words idea and mind in the broad sense in which they are commonly employed in English—of these animals. By presenting to a parrot a particular kind of food, and always accompanying the action by the utterance of the name of the food, an association may undoubtedly be created between the object and the sound. Dogs answer to their names; every one who is familiar with them knows the effect which may be produced by saying "cats" or "bad dog"; and although it is commonly asserted that they are guided by the inflexion of the voice, there is every likelihood that if they can apprehend differences in the modulation of the sound, they can also apprehend differences in the way in which it is broken up by articulation—although the multiplicity of the latter kind of differences prevents them from going very far in this direction.

For the full possession of language, it is requisite not only that sound-ideas, vocal combinations, and ideas of the objects, should exist, but also that they should be rightly linked or associated together. A person would be unable to speak in an intelligible manner, who should either join the idea of the sound b, instead of the sound a, to the object A or to its idea, or should join the muscular movements productive of the sound b, to the idea of the sound a, or of the object A. Here, then, we have two additional conditions, making, with those which have already been enumerated, seven in all. The disorder of speech produced by defect of these last two conditions, is called *heterophasia*; it might be called *associative aphasia*, and distinguished into *sensory*, where the idea of the object is associated with wrong sounds, and *motor*, where the right sounds are associated with movements which do not produce them, but produce other sounds entirely different. To relieve the tedium of a somewhat dry analysis, we shall now give cases of each of these affections. Two cases, illustrative of the first of them, and also throwing light on a philosophical question which used to be much discussed, are supplied by Dr. Bateman :—

It is a very old debate (says the Dean of Norwich in his book, "The Idle Word") whether or not it is possible to reason mentally, without having the words in the mind, which represent the subjects of our reasoning. Now, I can answer this question affirmatively, as will be seen by the following cases of perversion of speech which have been recorded by two of the most distinguished physicians of modern times. Dr. W. D. Moore, of Dublin, had under his care a gentleman, who, although his intelligence was unimpaired, had completely lost the connexion between ideas and words. On one occasion Dr. Moore was much puzzled by his patient, who was in bed, saying to him, "*Clean my boots.*" Finding that he was not understood, he became much excited, and cried out vehemently, "*Clean my boots by walking on them!*" At length it was ascertained that the cause of his disquietude was the candle shining on his face, and that the object of his unintelligible sentences was to have the curtain drawn; when this was done he appeared quite gratified. Another still more remarkable instance of the want of connexion between words employed and the ideas intended to be conveyed, is recorded by the late Professor Trousseau, of Paris, the subject of it being a lady, Madame B—, the mother-in-law of a physician, who was affected with the following strange misapplication of language :—Whenever she received a call from a visitor, she rose to receive him with a benevolent smile on her countenance, and, pointing to a chair, said—" *Pig, brute, stupid fool.*" Madame B— begs you to be seated, her son-in-law would then say, giving this interpretation to her wishes thus strangely expressed. Here, again, the idea in this lady's mind was courteously to ask her visitor to be seated, whilst the words actually used were those of coarse and vulgar abuse.—("Darwinism Tested by Language," pp. 112—115.)

In these cases there appears to have been no consciousness of the inappropriateness of the words used; in other cases the patients are aware that the words said are not those which ought to be said, but cannot bring themselves to articulate the proper ones. An American author gives some excellent examples of this kind, and among these the following:—

A man named Le Long, aged eighty-four years, had entered the hospital (the Bicêtre) for a fracture of the neck of the femur. Eighteen months before he had been treated in the medical service for a temporary apoplexy, which had deprived him of the faculty of speech, but had caused no paralysis. Le Long, whose intelligence, facial expression, and ability to gesticulate were very striking, made himself perfectly well understood, although able to pronounce indistinctly only a very few words, but which were, nevertheless, properly applied. These words were—"oui," "non," "toujours," "tois" for *trois*, and "Lelo" for *Le Long*. Thus, when asked, "Can you write?" he answered, "Oui." "Have you any children?" "Oui." "How many?" "Tois," but, at the same time, as if aware he was not answering correctly, he raised four fingers. "How many boys?" "Tois," raising two fingers. "How many girls?" "Tois," holding up two fingers. "What time is it by this watch?" "Tois," at the same time raising ten fingers to show that it was ten o'clock. "How old are you?" To this question he replied by two gestures; the one consisting of raising eight fingers, and the other of four fingers, by which he meant that he was eighty-four years old.—(Hammond, "A Treatise on the Diseases of the Nervous System," p. 182. Sixth edition.)

Another case cited by Dr. Hammond is that of a certain Madame Hennaert, the wife of a professor of mathematics at Utrecht. This lady, unlike Le Long, could employ words to a large extent, but she used them in the wrong places: when she wanted a chair she asked for a table, and demanded a glass when she desired a book. Here there seems to have been a defect in the association of the ideas, both with the sounds and with the vocal movements, for sometimes she herself discovered that she had made use of the wrong word, but, when the proper name was supplied, could not pronounce it; while on other occasions she was angry when what she had named was brought to her. In the case of Le Long there was probably a certain want of co-ordination; he could not produce the more difficult sounds, *r* before a vowel, or *ng* final, although he could utter a somewhat similar sound in the very familiar word *non*. In circumstances like this it is difficult to say how far the wrong word is uttered simply because the right one will not come; when there are only a few words at command, they lie on the surface of the mind, suggest themselves at once, and are uttered before the person affected has had time to think. The present writer remembers a medical man who suffered from aphasia,

and could say scarcely any other words but "yes" and "no,"—"no" with facility, but "yes" only with much greater difficulty. The result was that he constantly said "no" when he meant "yes," immediately afterwards making efforts to correct himself. It is also curious that in the majority of cases of aphasia where there is defective association between the object and the idea of the sound of its name, the association fails in passing from the object to the idea of the sound, but holds in passing from the name to the object. This is readily explained by the psychological law of exclusive association. The name is associated only with the objects which it denotes; the objects are associated with many other things besides their names. We forget language in the order in which we learn it; it is much easier for one who is only partially acquainted with a foreign language to say what object is denoted by a given name in that language, than, given the object, to find its name. *Pari modo*, most aphasic persons, although they are unable to recall the names of objects, understand what is said when they are spoken to; i. e., the name once supplied, they know what object it is a name of. Reading and writing, however, are later acquisitions than the intelligent hearing of words; and as what has been more recently acquired is also the first to be lost, reading and writing are often impossible when spoken language is still understood. The following case, with which we shall close our examples of aphasia, illustrates several of the above points:—

A sober, intelligent man, sixty years of age, on the evening of September 2, 1822, suddenly began to speak incoherently, and became quite unintelligible to those around him. It was discovered that he had forgotten the name of every object in nature. His recollection of things seemed to be unimpaired, but the names by which men and things were known were entirely obliterated from his mind, or, rather, he had lost the faculty by which they were called up by the control of the will. He was by no means inattentive, however, to what was going on, and he recognized friends and acquaintances perhaps as quickly as on any former occasion; but their names, or even his own or his wife's name, appeared to have no place in his recollection. . . . He comprehended distinctly every word which was spoken or addressed to him; and, though he had ideas adequate to form a full reply, the words by which these ideas are expressed seemed to have been entirely obliterated from his mind. By way of experiment I would sometimes mention to him the name of a person or thing, his own name, for example, or the name of some one of his domestics, when he could repeat it after me distinctly once or twice; but generally before he could do so a third time the word was gone from him as completely as if he had never heard it pronounced. When any person read to him from a book, he had no difficulty in perceiving the meaning of the passage, but he could not himself read, and the reason seemed to be that he had forgotten the elements of written language, viz., the names of the letters of the alphabet.—(Hammond, pp. 178, 179.)

We may now proceed to inquire what is the antecedent probability that there is a cerebral centre, or that there are cerebral centres, for language, judging merely from philosophical principles. And when we say from philosophical principles, we mean from the principles of the scholastic philosophy, which has supplied the best general division of the faculties and phenomena of the mind, although the Scholastics themselves did not agree, and could not be expected to agree, in details. Their primary division of the mental powers was into the lower or animal, and higher or spiritual, or faculties of the separate soul. To the former class, according to their teaching, belong feelings, movements, and the power of association, which is described in their commentaries on Aristotle's "*De Memoria et Reminiscentia*." Feelings are either vivid or faint; the faint feelings, which they called *phantasmata*, being copies of the vivid. The vivid feelings are sensations, and the lower emotions, such as anger, grief, desire, and others which they enumerate. All these, they said, are common to us and the lower animals; they never take place without the co-operation of the body; they could not exist in a purely spiritual nature. The animal character of these phenomena, and the participation in them of the bodily organism, was placed in even a stronger light by the Scholastics than it is by non-materialist modern writers. But, according to them, the higher powers of intellect and will are only partially and indirectly dependent on the organism. Our volitions are not merely the mental sides of corporeal activities of an animated body; they are distinctly and purely spiritual attributes, although they may—not necessarily, but freely—depend on the body, by reason of the operation of lower phenomena as motives. Our intellections, the products of the operation of the intellect proper, have not material correlatives, as *phantasmata* have; but as no intellectual act or contemplation can, in our present state, take place except in presence of *phantasmata*, even our intellectual activities have, indirectly, material concomitants.* And finally,

* Thus S. Thomas gives as a reason of the larger size of the brain in man, the greater development of the lower powers requisite in order that these should be sufficiently capable servants of the intellectual faculties. "*Necessarium fuit quod homo inter omnia animalia, respectu sui corporis haberet maximum cerebrum, tum ut liberius in eo perficerentur operationes interiorum virium sensitivarum, quæ sunt necessariae ad intellectus operationem, tum* ("*Pars Prima Summæ*," q. 91, a. 3, ad. 1.) Hence, mediately, even the intellect does not operate without the co-operation of the nervous system. "*Impossibile est . . . intellectum nostrum, secundum præsentis vite statum, quo passibili corpori conjungitur, aliquid intelligere in actu, nisi convertendo se ad phantasmata. Et hoc duobus indicis apparet. Primo quidem, quia cum intellectus sit vis quædam non utens cor-*

among the proper operations of the intellect were particularly mentioned Inference and Generalization, which the lower faculties could mimic, but could not attain to.

From this it is easy to see what position, with respect to, language, would have been taken up by the Scholastics in presence of a more complete knowledge of the nervous system than the physiology of their day permitted them to have.* The

porali organo, nullo modo impediretur in suo actu per lesionem alicujus corporalis organi, nisi requireretur ad ejus actum actus alicujus potentia utentis organo corporali. Utuntur autem organo corporali sensus, et imaginatio, et aliae vires pertinentes ad partem sensitivam. Unde . . . videmus quod impedito actu virtutis imaginativae per lesionem organi, ut in phreneticis, et similiter impedito actu memorativae virtutis, ut in lethargicis, impeditur homo ab intelligendo in actu etiam ea quorum scientiam precepit. Secundo, quia hoc quilibet in seipso experiri potest, quod quando aliquis conatur aliquid intelligere, format sibi aliqua phantasmata, per modum exemplorum, in quibus quasi inspicat quod intelligere studet." (Ib., q. 89, a. 7, *in corpore*.) From the above it will have been seen that the sentient powers, which operate in and through a corporeal organ, are not merely the external senses, but include other faculties as well. These the Scholastics called the internal senses; they are enumerated in another place by S. Thomas (q. 77, a. 4) as being the *sensus communis*, where the things received by the different external senses come together and are collated one with another; the *phantasia* or imagination, *locus phantasmatum*; the *vis memorativa*, and a *vis aestimativa*, which is equivalent to what we call instinct, "cui," remarks S. Thomas, "medici assignant determinatum organum, scilicet mediam partem capitis" (l. c.). Of course, the idea of localizing these faculties in different parts of the cerebro-spinal nervous system would be quite in harmony with such a view of their nature. S. Thomas denies that they are faculties of the soul as such; they are faculties, he says, neither of the soul as such, nor of the body as such, but of the animated body, the compositum or conjunctum of soul and body; and he says the same thing of the nutritive and other powers, which obviously have distinct organs. "Sentire non est proprium animae, neque corporis, sed conjuncti. Potentia ergo sensitiva est in conjuncto, sicut in subjecto. Non ergo sola anima est subjectum potentialium suarum. . . . Exercentur per organa corporalia sicut visio per oculum, auditus per aurem. Et simile est de omnibus aliis operationibus sensitivae et nutritivae partis" (q. 77, a. 5, *in corpore*). We have been careful to notice these facts, because there is a too prevalent but quite groundless idea that the conclusions derivable from recent investigations into the physiology of the nervous system are in some way or other contrary to Catholic Philosophy. As matter of fact, and as far as these investigations have as yet gone, the general outcome of them is that the brain is so distributed among the lower faculties that there is no room left in it for organs of the higher. What is contrary to Catholic Philosophy is not the physiological investigations, but the psychological speculation that the higher faculties are to be resolved into the lower. It may be well to remark that while, according to the Scholastics, the lower emotions cannot exist in a purely spiritual nature, analogous conditions, which we may call or decline to call emotions as we choose, may exist in an entirely spiritual being.

* The stock localization of the "internal senses" was that given by Avicenna or Ibn-Sina; it is from time to time alluded to with general approbation in the writings of the Schoolmen, and is contained in his

production of articulate or inarticulate vocal sounds is, and has always been known to be, the mere result of movements; and looking to the effectuation of these sounds in themselves, and apart from the action of the intellect or will leading to such effectuation, and indirectly concerned in it, they would have found in the discovery of a corresponding nervous mechanism only a confirmation of their philosophical system. Such a mechanism, they would have said, has been given to man—or man has been endowed with the power of unconsciously forming the plastic matter of his brain into such a mechanism as he learns language—in view of intellect and will, just as he has been furnished with a hand; it is in itself material, but subserves higher purposes, as a pencil or a diagram does. The sounds produced are, again, in themselves, *αἰσθητά*, not *νοητά*; and believing that both sensations and their phantasmata have, directly and immediately, material concomitants, they would not have been surprised to have found a distinct part of the brain set apart for the production of these concomitants. They would most likely have merely observed that it must be in

"Canon Medicinæ," l. 1, Fen. 1—Doctrina Sexta, De Virtutibus Animalibus, cap. 5. The faculties peculiar to animals, he there tells us, are either sensory or motor; the sensory or apprehensive faculty is either manifest or occult. The sensory faculties whose operations are manifest are the five senses. The first of the occult (the internal senses of the Scholastics) is the *sensus communis*, which physicians do not, but philosophers do, distinguish from the phantasia. Its seat is the anterior lobe of the cerebrum (*anterior cerebri ventriculus*—probably here *lobe*). The seat of the second, the *virtus cogitativa*, which diversely combines the phantasmata preserved in the *phantasia*, is the middle lobe of the cerebrum; it is called *v. cogitativa* only when the cause of the formation of these new combinations is the intellect; but when the *virtus existimativa animalis* is the cause of this, it is denominated imagination. The *v. existimativa animalis* is the *sensus existimativus* of S. Thomas; it is, says Ibn-Sina, the faculty "whereby an animal judges that a wolf is unfriendly and its offspring friendly to it, and that one who has been wont to give to it is a friend, and need not be fled from. And this judgment takes place after a non-rational manner. But friendship and enmity cannot be apprehended by [external] sense. Man also frequently employs this faculty in many of his judgments." He appears to localize it along with the imagination, or *virtus cogitativa*. The last of the internal senses is the *virtus memorativa*, which preserves the products of the *v. existimativa*; it is located in the posterior lobe of the brain. We quote from the Venetian (Latin) edition of 1608. It will be understood that the conservation of higher or supersensuous ideas is not to be referred to the *v. memorialis* or *memorativa*, which conserves only the correlative combinations of phantasmata (formed by the intellect) or by the *v. existimativa animalis* without which, on account of the *conversio ad phantasmata*, the higher ideas cannot present themselves to the mind. For instance, we do not believe God to be a word, a light, or a man sitting on a throne; but it is impossible to think of Him without having these or analogous phantasmata before consciousness.

connection with the auditory nerve, just as the part of the brain (if there is one) set apart for the origination of the groups of motor stimuli which excite the muscles of sonation and articulation must be in connection with the motor nerves going to the organs of voice and speech. Nor would they have felt greater difficulty about the material concomitants of the ideas which are symbolized by the sounds emitted. If, they would have observed, these ideas are ideas of the lower or sensible order, they must, according to the principles of our philosophy, have material concomitants somewhere; where they are is a mere matter of detail which it is for you physiologists to discover; and after you have discovered it, we shall be most happy to incorporate your conclusions with our psychological system, which, as you perceive, leaves room for them beforehand. And, they might reasonably have added, we shall expect to find that the idea-concomitants are in connection with the sound-sensation concomitants and the movement-originating region, while perhaps these two may be in direct connection with each other. If, on the other hand, the ideas are ideas of the higher order—if they are such as the ideas of freedom, intellect, virtue, moral obligation, metaphysical necessity, God,—or if they are generalizations, or contain the nexus of inference, you need expect to find no direct and immediate material concomitants of them; but if you could look at the matter narrowly enough, you might expect to find among the phantasma concomitants those to which this or that person turns when he is contemplating or eliciting this or that idea. For all persons do not, under such circumstances, turn to the same phantasmata.

Thus, by the mere development of the principles of the Scholastic Philosophy, without any alteration in these principles themselves, we may see how far the Schoolmen would have regarded language as an animal or an “immaterial” faculty, and how far they would have assigned to it a cerebral organ and a possible animal origin. Leaving on one side the complexity of the human system of language-signs, there is no difficulty in supposing signs of ideas to exist in the lower animals; but no animal not possessed of reason would be capable of inventing and using genitive absolutes, or indicative, subjunctive, and optative moods. A merely animal language might possess words like in sound to those by which we express inference and general ideas; but these words would not in such a language fulfil the same function, although, whether in human or animal speech, such words, once invented, would have their material concomitants like other sounds. It is, therefore, on the existence of words veritably expressing either general ideas or such ideas as that of moral obligation, and on the multitude of

sound-signs and the complexity of language, impossible to any but a rational nature, that the stress is to be laid in discussing the higher than merely animal origin of language. And if the stress is to be laid here, the fundamental question is one, not of vital or organic, but of mental evolution,—whether, that is, the higher faculties of the mind of man can have been evolved from the lower faculties which he possesses in common with the brutes.

Under these circumstances, we ought not to expect to find in man any superadded organ of language. We should merely anticipate that there would be a fuller development of those parts of the brain which are connected with phantasmata at arge, and in particular with phantasmata of sounds, if these are not mingled with other phantasmata; and of those which are connected with the lips, tongue, larynx, and other organs of speech. A larger cerebral development we do actually find; but it would as yet be unsafe to pronounce very decisively on the details. Dr. Bateman and others have, however, proved that there is no one determinate cerebral centre for language. Nor, considering the number of distinct conditions involved in rational language, was it antecedently probable that there should be such a centre.

ART. IX.—THE ASSENT DUE TO CERTAIN PAPAL UTTERANCES.

1. *Cardinal Franzelin, De Divina Traditione et De Habitudine Rationis Humane ad Divinam Fidem.* Romæ, MDCCCLXXV.
2. *Domenico Berti, Il Processo Originale di Galileo Galilei, pubblicato per la Prima Volta.* Roma. 1875.
3. *Revue des Deux Mondes.* Octobre, 1876.
4. *Le P. Eugène Desjardins, Encore Galilée.* Paris. 1877.

[It will prevent possible misconception, if we mention that the following article is not written by the Editor; though, of course, he is responsible for its contents, as for those of any other article.]

THE author of the "Confessions of a Revolutionist" says that it is wonderful how we ever stumble on theology in all our political questions. Donoso Cortes,* who has justly

* *Essays, &c., chap. i.*

been called one of the most profound thinkers of the nineteenth century, is astonished at these remarkable words, and observes on them, that there is nothing here to cause surprise but the surprise of M. Proudhon; for, he finally adds, theology, inasmuch as it is the science of God, is the ocean which contains and embraces all sciences, as God is the ocean which contains and embraces all things. The same author* ably points out how, even as the knowledge of the laws which control Governments, and of the laws which control human societies, is the possession of political and of social truth; so the knowledge of God comprises the knowledge of all these laws; and as the knowledge of God consists in knowing, by hearing and believing, what He affirms of Himself, and as theology is the science that has these affirmations for its object, it follows that "every affirmation relative to society or to Government, supposes an affirmation relative to God; or, what comes to the same, that every political and social, is necessarily converted into a theological, truth." It is, therefore, clear that a true understanding of historical facts, of those especially which involve in their importance weighty social and political questions, presupposes a true understanding of the doctrines, of the theological truths, with which they were at variance, or with which they harmonized. Principles, "unchangeable and eternal" as the first principle from which they flow, are the *criteria* by which men and men's acts, as they appear in public life and on the broad page of history should be judged, and then condemned or approved. By ignoring altogether the fundamental doctrinal tenets by which the Supreme Ruler means to have the world ruled, according to the dispensation which He has graciously established, or by completely losing sight, or completely making abstraction, in a most unpardonable manner, of theological teachings, writers without number have pored over the annals of the past, have written copiously of the characters, worthy and unworthy, who figure prominently on the dead record, have commented abundantly on the deeds which they did, and on the events to which they led the way; but, as the great De Maistre† so energetically says, although they have but too well shown that they knew how to *write*, they have also proved that they certainly never knew how to *read*.

With writers of this kind we have constantly to deal. Indeed a Catholic Review, which has to cope with them, cannot but feel indebted to them for many and able contributions, of which they have not been the authors, but to which they gave occasion, and which they oftentimes strongly called forth.

* Essays, &c., chap. i.

† Du Pape, livre II. chap. x.

In order to meet difficulties, real or imaginary, at the outset, and to stem the evil in its source, it is invariably necessary to remind such enemies of truth and friends of falsehood, of undeniable, saving principles, which they either ignore or spurn; to show forth such principles in all their harmony, in their unity and variety, in the full noonday of their truthful lustre, and strenuously to vindicate them against direct or indirect attacks. Widely different, indeed, must necessarily be the judgments formed on men and things, according to the different or opposite standards by which they are judged, and according to the various levels from which they are contemplated; but there is only one standard by which they can ever be fairly and duly appreciated,—that of unswerving principle, only one level from which they can be so viewed as to be seen in their true colours,—that of elevated, unbending truth.

We propose, then, in the present article, to give the teaching of Catholic theology on the assent due to certain papal utterances, which are not strictly infallible, because not *ex cathedra*; and, in showing forth this doctrine, we intend following, as a worthy and sure guide, his Eminence Cardinal Franzelin, the prince of living theologians, who, whilst filling with ability unsurpassed the chair of dogmatic theology in the Gregorian University of Rome, enriched the treasury of the queen of sciences with works which tell how admirably he laid hold of the *mind* of the Church, how he was deeply imbued with the spirit of her divine tradition, and in how masterly a manner he compassed in his vast intellect the teaching of her noble fathers. The elevation of the great professor to the dignity of Cardinal is itself a manifest proof of how the Holy See appreciated his valuable services, and if, indeed, we needed it, would be a strong and more than sufficient recommendation of his authority as a Roman Catholic divine. It is now more than two years since, after following the same leader through the teaching of tradition on Papal Infallibility, we announced our intention of treating the present question. It is not too late to do so even now. Whilst we follow the path marked out by the Jesuit Cardinal, we shall compress or develop his expositions and arguments with full freedom, and shall not be afraid of digressing, and of drawing from other sources tributaries to his purpose and ours.

A sketch of the other works mentioned at the heading of this article will serve as an admirable illustration of the special point of doctrine with which we deal. The publication of the original documents connected with Galileo's process has called forth champions from the two hostile, ever-opposed camps: one to attack the Church's conduct in that case, and to warn her

against a repetition of it; the other to justify that conduct, and to demonstrate that it was in full keeping with the Church's office and duty, that it was wise at the time, and would be wise at any time under the circumstances that then existed. This Review has more than once considered at length and in detail the whole case of Galileo; but a notice of the works before us will not be a disagreeable recital of what has been so often said, and will be far from irrelevant on the present subject.

Before entering on the question which occupies us, and as a preparation for its due consideration, Cardinal Franzelin lays down the principle that the Holy Apostolic See may prescribe theological opinions, or opinions bearing on theology, as to be followed, or proscribe them as to be avoided; and that, too, not solely with the intention of deciding the truth by a definitive sentence, but even without any such intention, from the need it has and the design it entertains of looking to the security of Catholic doctrine, whether absolutely, or relatively only to particular circumstances. Now, although in declarations of this sort there is not *infallible truth* of the doctrine, since the supposition is that there is no intention of definitely deciding such truth, still there is *infallible security*, both objectively, as regards the teaching so put forth, and subjectively, inasmuch as it is safe for all to embrace it; whereas to refuse to embrace it would not be safe, and would be a violation of the law whereby Christians are bound to be submissive to the teaching authority which has been instituted by God. Nor can it at all be reasonably said that infallible truth and infallible security in doctrinal matters come to one and the same thing, that one cannot exist without the other; for it is plain, as a moment's reflection would suffice to show, that a theory or particular point of doctrine can be infallibly secure without being infallibly true. Opinions, for instance, which are only probable, in a greater or less degree, and not at all quite certain, may be, as they often are, most safe. Absolute certainty is by no means requisite for absolute safety, which a well-grounded moral certitude can frequently insure. Such is the importance of this distinction between the defining sentences of the Sovereign Pontiff speaking *ex cathedra* and other doctrinal decrees, enjoining, or prohibiting, which emanate from the Holy See,—a distinction to be borne in mind both as regards the speculative truth and the practical application of the pronouncements,—that they who deny it would be forced, says Cardinal Franzelin, to the absurd position of holding that all such decrees, referring in any way to doctrine, are *ex cathedra* definitions. Ecclesiastical history, the Holy See's usual way of acting, and the Vatican Council's careful

explanation of what an *ex cathedra* definition really is, show how manifestly false this would be.

As we distinguish between *ex cathedra* definitions and other decisions of the Holy See which are not *ex cathedra*; as we distinguish between the *infallible truth* and the *infallible security* of doctrine; so, in the teaching authority instituted by Christ, we must distinguish between the *infallible authority*, which, by the aid of the Holy Ghost, *infallibly defines* truth, and the authority of *universal ecclesiastical provision*, or of doctrinal provision, which is the same authority as the other, not, however, exercising all its intensity in ultimately defining, but taking measures for the safety of the Church's teachings. The one belongs to the supreme Pontiff alone, and he cannot communicate it, so that if an *infallible definition* is said to be issued by any sacred Roman congregation, that manner of speaking is inexact; for, whilst a congregation is consulted, performs its duties of labour and research, and gives in the result of its own deliberations, it is only the Pontiff that *defines*. The authority of *universal ecclesiastical provision*, on the other hand, may be communicated by the Pope, in a greater or less extent, to certain congregations of Cardinals, not so as to leave it independent of, but keeping it dependent on, his own control. From this it is clear that whilst every *ex cathedra* definition is, no doubt, a definition of the *Holy See*, still every decree of the Holy See is not at all an *ex cathedra* definition; a decree of a pontifical congregation can never be said to be *ex cathedra*, in the exact and genuine sense of the word.

After these preliminaries, in which we have very closely adhered to Cardinal Franzelin's text (pp. 127-129), and which we deem of much moment, we come to our thesis itself.

It is quite false that the only authority to whose decisions *intellectual assent* is due is that of God revealing, or that of the Church of God or Roman Pontiff infallibly defining; for even as an assent of properly and *immediately divine faith* is due to the authority of God revealing; and as an assent of *ecclesiastical* or *mediately divine faith* is due to the authority of the church of God or of the Roman Pontiff defining any doctrine as true, though not as revealed;—so there is an *intellectual religious assent* due to the authority of universal ecclesiastical provision.

Before proceeding to fully prove this thesis, which is upheld by "the weightiest arguments," it is useful, and even necessary, to show its real nature and drift, what it does mean and imply, what it does not mean and does not imply.

The infallible *ex cathedra* definitions of the Holy See may have for object either truths revealed by God, and defined as

such, to which so defined assent of properly and immediately divine faith must be given by all Catholics; or their object may be truths which are not revealed, but which are connected with, and have a close bearing on, those that are: as the former, when defined as revealed, must be believed by immediately divine faith; so the latter, when defined as *true*, must be believed as *such* by ecclesiastical or *mediately divine* faith. By a similar infallible definition, it follows, one doctrine may be condemned as heretical and opposed to the teaching of divine revelation, and another may be condemned, not as heretical or directly antagonistic to revealed truth, but as deserving of some censure, as *false*, as rash, as scandalous, or the like; and in all cases the doctrine is exactly what the infallible authority declares it ex cathedra to be (pp. 123, 124). Now, our thesis has not to deal with truths ultimately defined as revealed or as true, nor with error solemnly condemned as heretical, rash, or not safe; it has not to deal with ex cathedra decisions of any sort; but it has to deal with decrees or decisions emanating from the Holy See, which are not ex cathedra at all, and which, consequently, are not necessarily of themselves, and do not claim to be, *infallibly true*. The formal object, that is to say, the authority to which, the reason why, assent is, and should be, given, fixes the species of the act of assent itself, which is of faith immediately or mediately divine, or an intellectual religious one, according as the authority is that of God revealing, that of the Church, or her supreme head, infallibly teaching, or that of sacred authority, not solemnly defining, but looking to the interests of Catholic doctrine.

In an article of this Review on Galileo and the Roman Congregations,* it was remarked how, although the notion that firm interior assent can be due to a fallible judgment has been denounced as extravagant, still nothing is more common in everyday life, nothing deemed less extravagant, and more in conformity with good common sense. Thus, a patient, it was said, gives firm assent to the decisions of an eminent medical doctor, and resolves on following his prescriptions, although, surely, the physician is not infallible. In like manner, it was maintained, "a firm interior assent, ordinarily not accompanied by any doubt whatever, yet not *so* firm as to be *incompatible* with the co-existence of doubt," is due to the doctrine of a congregational decree. This we find to be in fullest harmony with what the Cardinal, whose steps we now follow, lays down in his statement of the question before us. So sacred, he says, is the authority, in virtue of the supreme and universal magisterium,

* July, 1871.

that, even when it is not defining *ex cathedra* a doctrine to be held by the universal Church, but only, without such a definition, prescribing a doctrine to be followed or not followed, *obedience* is due to it. Our adversaries, he continues, do not deny that this *obedience* is due, but they restrict it to the omission of external acts, to a *respectful silence*, to not teaching, writing, or expressing opinions on any doctrine forbidden in this way; and they hold that without an *ex cathedra* definition *submission of the mind* cannot be exacted to such a degree that a person should lay aside his opinions, and embrace the opposite with so firm a certitude as to declare adhesion to it on oath. We, however, he adds, maintain that in delivered judgments of this sort, even without an *ex cathedra* definition, an *obedience* is exacted, and should be tendered, which includes a *submission of the mind*; not, to be sure, that the doctrine put forth in such a decree should be looked on, and should be believed, as *infallibly true or false*, but that it *should* be deemed *infallibly secure*. Hence we argue that the intellectual religious assent of which we speak is *not* "so firm as to be *incompatible* with the co-existence of doubt," as to the *truth or falsehood* of a doctrine, although it is "ordinarily not accompanied by any doubt whatever"; still it *is*, and should be, "so firm as to be *incompatible* with the co-existence of doubt" as to that doctrine's *infallible security*, and the insecurity of its contradictory. It is true, then, that "without an *ex cathedra* definition, *submission of the mind*" to a doctrine as *infallibly true or false*, as of faith, "cannot be exacted to such a degree, that a person should lay aside his opinions, and embrace the opposite with so firm a certitude as to declare adhesion to it on oath"; yet it is not less true that, without an *ex cathedra* definition, *submission of the mind* can be exacted, and even in this extreme degree, to a point of doctrine as *infallibly secure*, and to the proposition that the contradictory of some given doctrine is *infallibly unsafe*.

In the same article, the question as to whether this assent is due under pain of *sin*, whether mortal or venial, was but mentioned in passing, and was, as it formerly had been, avoided by express design. Cardinal Franzelin, too, leaves this question to the professors of moral theology, and is satisfied with remarking on it, that, by reason of the *object*, and taking the matter in itself, there can be no *sin*, immediately or mediately, against faith; that, taking the *subject* into consideration, there can be no *sin* without deliberate obstinacy, and that the existence of *sin*, as well as its gravity, depends on many circumstances regarding the object and the subject, which he would not take up singly and go through one after the other (p. 153).

It must be observed, moreover, that there are some decrees

issued by the Holy See which enjoin silence, and nothing more ; as was the case, for instance, with the decision of Paul V. on the auxilia of divine grace ; and there are also private letters, in which certain authors, or schools, or the like, are recommended ; of neither of these does the present thesis speak, but of those replies and decrees by which a doctrine is laid down as to be followed or not to be followed, to be taught or not to be taught, to be defended or not to be defended ; and we contend that this following or not following, teaching or not teaching, defending or not defending, involves submission of the mind, and leaves no room for dissimulation and hypocrisy.

We shall arrange under three headings the proofs we adduce to uphold our thesis ; under the first we shall give general proofs drawn from principles fundamental in theological science ; under the second shall come those which are furnished by certain documents issued by the Holy See ; and under the third, arguments drawn from the teaching of private doctors of name and weight.

I. First of all, then, there is an intellectual religious assent due to pronouncements of the Holy See which do not bear upon them the stamp of infallibility ; if the obligation of such assent is in fullest harmony with essential constituent elements of the Christian economy, with the relation between the teaching and the taught, which is the *physical essence*, so to say, of our religion, and if the lawfulness of refusing such assent would be altogether at variance with, and opposed to, these elements and this relation. Now, that such is the case can very easily be shown. Authority to preach the Word of God on the one hand, and the obligation of hearing and believing it when preached on the other, were the two great essentials of the Christian religion in its foundation and first propagation, and since a thing cannot last if its essentials cease to be such, they are the essentials and constituents of that same religion to the present day, and so shall they be to the end. Our able author, at the beginning of his treatise on Tradition (p. 27) says that authority, a personal authentic magisterium, apostolic preaching, on the one side, and, on the other, a corresponding subjection, obedience, and obligation of receiving from the persons invested with that power the faith which is handed down, and its explanations, are not something external to the Christian religion and economy, are not something added on to it, as it were, by chance in certain changing circumstances, but they are an internal constituent, and an essential property of the economy instituted by Christ. We do not say, he continues, that the authentic magisterium and the corresponding duty of obedience of faith are essential *a priori* to any religion ; but we do say, that they

are essential to the Christian religion according to the very form which Christ impressed on it; for there is here no question of the metaphysical essence of religion in general, but of one of the essential elements, and of the *physical essence*, as it were, of the Christian religion instituted in this special form by Christ the Incarnate Word. Is it not then in fullest harmony with the *unchangeable* relation between the authority which has power to bind, and those subject to it, that the persons invested with the authority should meet with a religious submission to their dictates, even when they do not speak in all the fulness of their power, with anathema to crush the unbelieving? And would not lawfulness to refuse the submission called for be altogether at variance with, and opposed to, this *essential element* of the Christian economy? Surely nobody would say that the duty of filial respect and obedience would be fulfilled by a child who would obey only when the parent would give a rigid command and say: "If you do not obey, I shall disinherit you." Nor would anybody assert that a citizen in any society, in any condition, under any law, is bound to do only what is commanded, and to avoid only what is forbidden under pain of the severest penalties. Filial duty and social duty require much more from the child and from the citizen; and much more right has the more sacred authority set up over the Christian family and vast society of the Church to exact submission *ex animo*, on the part of its subjects, to the teachings which it inculcates, even when it does not prescribe them with the utmost solemnity. Nothing could be more conformable to the relation between the parent and child, and between the ruling and ruled in the State, than alacrity and heartiness in doing things which are recommended, though not strictly enjoined; and very much opposed to it would be bargaining and measuring the reach of unavoidable subjection; so, too, and *a fortiori*, nothing more in keeping with the mutual relations between the Church authentically teaching and her children who are taught, than freely to offer the assent we speak of to the decisions which are infallibly safe, if not infallibly true; and entirely injurious and antagonistic to that relation would be the refusal of this assent, the denial that it is due. Therefore we argue the truth of the doctrine we have laid down, because of its harmony and close connection with a doctrine which is beyond all question, as the groundwork of Catholic teaching.

II. Our second argument flows from that just given, and is, it would seem, nothing more than a further development of it. It is drawn from the *mind* and understanding of the Church, both teaching and taught, which constitutes between the

authentic teachers and those instructed by them another relation, which may be fairly regarded as an effect, or as the natural outcome of that which we have just noticed. The Church of God is infallible in its teaching, in its universal preaching, and in its universal belief. A definition *ex cathedra* is indeed a criterion of infallible truth; but it is not the only one (p. 117). The Apostles, the first heralds of the Gospel and preachers of the Kingdom of Heaven, were all endowed with the extraordinary charisma of infallibility; all who would believe them and would be baptized should be saved, all who would not believe them should be condemned. The successors of the Apostles, taken singly and individually, are not infallible; but the head of that Apostolic succession and of the whole Church is infallible, and so are *all* the other pastors, collectively, together with him. Now, it is clear, and this seems to us a most powerful argument for the doctrine we lay down, that if the faithful are not bound to give any internal, intellectual, religious assent to any doctrinal utterances that are not strictly infallible, they are free to disregard and slight, and even condemn, at least internally, the ordinary teaching of their pastors — a doctrine the admission of which would be simply monstrous, and would mean the complete overthrow of the order established by the Good Shepherd between the pastors and their flocks, for in the latter it would substitute for the *duty* of learning the power of teaching and the right of criticising. On this special point the very wording of the thesis, to which the principle here put forward comes as a scholium, is deserving of minute consideration. The thesis is, that the conscience and profession of faith in the whole body of the faithful are always preserved free from error by the Spirit of truth through the authentic magisterium of the Apostolic succession. *Therefore*, although the *duty of learning*, and not the power of authentically teaching, belongs both to individuals from among the people and to entire peoples; still the "Catholic mind" of the whole Christian people, and their common belief in a dogma, ought to be looked upon as one of the criteria of divine tradition (p. 103).

This statement involves two theological truths which are correlative to one another. The members of the Apostolic succession, the pastors of the people, alone have the right and power of teaching authentically in the Church of God; whilst the *duty of learning*, the obligation of being taught, is incumbent on all the other children of that Church. This statement involves, moreover, two other theological truths which are also correlative to one another. The authentic magisterium is the cause, partially, ministerially and outwardly (p. 104), of the

infallibility of the Church's universal belief; and this latter, consequently, is, in a corresponding manner, the effect of the former. From these truths we argue that this duty of learning, this obligation of being taught, brings with it the obligation and the duty of entering into and of embracing the "Catholic mind"; and, in like manner, we say, that this second obligation brings with it the duty of giving the assent of which we speak to the decisions which, as we hold, demand and have a right to demand it.

The doctrine of Catholic theology on the duty incumbent on Catholics of cleaving to the "Catholic mind," of entering into the sentiment of the universal Mother Church, is of the most plain and emphatic kind. The earliest Fathers of the Church, those who, from their nearness to the Apostolic times, are looked on as almost Apostles, lay the greatest stress on it. S. Clement of Rome,* S. Ignatius,† the martyr bishop of Antioch, S. Polycarp,‡ and Hegisippus, a little later on, unite in asserting that Christ our Lord gave orders to His Apostles to ordain bishops to be their successors in the ministry through a series that should never die out; that *union* with the bishops, who are to be followed as Christ Himself, is necessary for the avoiding of heresy and the preserving of the true doctrine; and that this is the means by which the tradition received from the beginning is to be held to the end. S. Ignatius of Antioch especially, whose epistles are monumental and of greatest authority in the Church, is solicitous, above all else, about the harmony of consent and of union between flocks and their bishops, as the great means of preserving the one sound doctrine of faith and of remaining true to the divinely-instituted power which governs the Church. His words are so telling, and so much to our present purpose, that we deem it well worth while quoting a few of them:—"I have warned you first of all," he says, "to be unanimous in the *mind* of God; for Jesus Christ, our inseparable life, is the mind of the Father, as the bishops, who are constituted as such all over the earth, are *in the mind* of Jesus Christ; whence it behoveth you to be unanimously of the mind and opinions of your bishops. For whomsoever the father of the household sendeth to govern his family, we should receive as him who sendeth him." The bishops, taken individually, are not infallible; they issue no *ex cathedra* definitions; but they are the links which bind the more remote members to their head; they are authentic teachers in the Church, authentic witnesses of the Church's teaching and belief,

* Clem. Rom. Ep. I. ad Cor. n. 42.

† Ad Eph. n. 3-6.

‡ Ep. n. 13.

authentic exponents of *her mind*; therefore, even in doubtful matters, the presumption is always in their favour; therefore, it *behoveth* their flocks, it is the duty of their flocks, to be of *their mind*, that so they may be of the mind of the great Mother Church.

As, then, the congregations of Cardinals, who, under the immediate control and close supervision of the sovereign Pontiff, superintend the teaching of the entire Church, and issue doctrinal decisions with the stamp of the sacred, though not absolutely infallible, authority with which they are invested, are exponents of the Church's mind and witnesses to her tradition, exponents of, and witnesses to, the untarnished Roman tradition in particular, no less, but even more closely, than bishops; and as the faithful are bound to be of the mind of the latter, because of their relations to the Church and to them, so, surely, and *a fortiori*, are they bound to be of the mind of the former, which they cannot be unless they receive their decisions with religious, mental assent and with docility of will. The ecclesiastical preaching, the rule of understanding, the rule of apostolic truth, and corresponding to them, the conscience of faith, the Catholic understanding, the ecclesiastical mind and feeling, the faith written in the heart, the unwritten wisdom (p. 96)—all this, forcibly taught and expounded by the Church through her fathers and doctors, means all we say, or, if it does not mean that, it is devoid of meaning altogether.

III. Furthermore the sacred authority of a Pontifical congregation which issues congregational decrees is a motive amply sufficient to exact intellectual submission of a religious character; and, consequently, because it is so sufficient a motive, this submission is due to its pronouncements. This third argument follows naturally from those already advanced. The authority of which we treat is, with the sole exception of that which is absolutely infallible, the greatest on earth as regards the matters which come under its supervision and are compassed in its wide-extended sphere; and if, in these matters and within that sphere, it is unable to make those under it enter into its views by mental subjection, and has no right to exact such subjection, assuredly there is no superiority, no eminence in any profession, that can claim weight on the convictions of the inferior and ignorant. "Since the peculiar source of argument and the peculiar and principal reason for which assent is given in theological doctrine is not the intrinsic perception of the truth, but the authority which proposes it, the sacred authority of universal doctrinal provision is, in virtue of its office, a most sufficient motive for which a pious will can and *should* command the mind to surrender itself to it

by a religious or theological consent" (p. 131). This ever-living authority not only is a witness of the Church's tradition, of her teaching in all times back to the earliest ages, but is, moreover, invested in a body of men eminent for their abilities and learning, who make it the business of their lives to study and fathom the doctrines which have been handed down to them, and which they have to preserve undefiled at the fountain-head, under the living shadow of the hoary rock. It would be more than absurd to say that any Catholic could reasonably and without breach of duty oppose his private judgment or opinion to the judgment of such a body, and should not submit with heart, and soul, and mind to its official utterances. These utterances are not infallibly true, no doubt, though the strong presumption is that they really are true, but they are always infallibly safe; whereas the judgment of the individual cannot pretend to either infallible truth or infallible safety. Which, then, should preponderate? We repeat that this sacred authority is an amply sufficient motive to claim assent, not hypocritical, but genuine and intellectual, from its subjects; and, therefore, this assent on their part is due to its authoritative decisions.

A fresh proof of a general sort, and one that would admit of considerable development, is furnished by the fact that it may happen, and does happen, that doubt may exist in the mind of Catholics, even of the highly educated, as to whether some particular document coming forth from the Holy See is or is not *ex cathedra*. In the case of such uncertainty no Catholic could venture to think that he is free to accept or not accept, to submit to or not submit to, the doctrine embodied in the declaration of which the authority is questioned. The only safe course would evidently be to subject the intellect as well as the will to all which is taught in this way. Whence it follows that mental subordination should be given to doctrinal pronouncements the absolute infallibility of which is not quite certain. The nature of the assent itself will, of course, be in accordance with the motive for which it is offered.

We now proceed from these general proofs to those which are supplied by particular documents issued by the Holy See. We shall see how the Holy See has over and over again exacted intellectual subjection to declarations sent forth from it which were not *ex cathedra*; and as it would be simply preposterous to suppose that the Holy See has been repeatedly officially doing and claiming what it could not do and had no right to claim—absurd to think that it has been repeatedly going beyond the limits of its power; the one logical and natural conclusion to be drawn from the pronouncements which we are

going to consider is, that the assent so often claimed was rightfully claimed and is always due.

I. We shall first call attention to the reply sent by the sacred Roman Congregation of the Inquisition to the question whether seven propositions of Professor Ubaghs relative to ontologism could or could not be *safely taught*. The demand was *an tuto tradi possent*? After taking the votes of the consultors, and after maturely weighing each of the propositions, the most eminent members of that congregation returned an answer in the negative, which bears date the 18th September, 1861. "Surely no theologian would say that this declaration of the Sacred Congregation was an *ex cathedra* definition" (p. 137); nor could any theologian maintain that by this decision silence, and nothing more, was enjoined; for by that decision the doctrine of the seven propositions was declared *unsafe*. Evidently, then, it would have been but mockery to ask this doctrinal pronouncement, and but mockery for the Sacred Congregation to give it, if it did not carry with it the obligation on the part of Catholics of believing that the teaching in question really was what it was thus declared to be. Wherefore, says our most eminent author, by this reply—"The Sacred Congregation has judged that the doctrine here laid down cannot be safely taught,"—any Catholic theologian will look on the simply and strictly theological question as solved, and will deem all arguments brought forward in opposition as done away with; although assuredly he can find in this response no answer to the philosophical question, why and for what intrinsic reason is the teaching unsafe? The Sacred Congregation meant that the propositions should be *believed* to be unsafe; as is clear from another document that speaks of a doctrine which should be heartily condemned and rejected, and which, it is said, was plainly like that of the seven propositions. We conclude our argument from this reply; it was not an *ex cathedra* definition, still it called for interior submission to what it officially affirmed.

II. We next come to a letter, bearing date the 2nd March, 1866, sent by Cardinal Patrizi, in the name of the Sacred Congregations of the Inquisition and of the Index, to his Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Mechlin. The letter refers to the teachings of the same Louvain Professor, and from it we translate this extract:—"The Cardinals have undertaken to examine other teachings contained in more recent editions of the same author's works; and they have clearly seen inculcated in these books teachings like some of the seven propositions which your Eminence will find on an enclosed leaf, and which the supreme Congregation of the Holy Office declared unsafe on the

18th of September, 1861; and they have seen too that there are other opinions in the same books which are put forward without sufficient caution. This is especially the case with regard to the opinion called *Traducianism*, and with regard to what is said on the principle of life in man, which should by all means be corrected. The most eminent Cardinals, therefore, have come to this decision: that in the books on philosophy already published by G. C. Ubaghs there are found teachings and opinions which cannot be taught without danger. His Holiness Pius IX. has approved and confirmed this decision by his Supreme Authority."

It has been objected that this letter, or the judgment contained in it, is an *ex cathedra* definition; and for our purpose it is necessary to establish beyond doubt that it is not such, before we construct our argument upon it. This congregational sentence, it is said, is an *ex cathedra* definition, because the Sovereign Pontiff confirmed it by his supreme authority, and because Cardinal Patrizi is found later on to say that by it the Louvain question was *defined*. We answer, that in order that any sentence should be an *ex cathedra* definition it should be issued by the Sovereign Pontiff himself, and in his own name, since, as has been already laid down, he cannot communicate his infallible authority to any dignitary under heaven; this sentence was issued by Cardinal Patrizi in the name of the Congregations of the Inquisition and of the Index, not by the Pope in his own name. The substance of the document is to be found in the words:—"The most eminent Cardinals, therefore, have come to this decision: that in the books on philosophy already published by G. C. Ubaghs, there are found teachings and opinions which cannot be taught without danger." An *ex cathedra* definition is never couched in such terms, but is formulated in a widely different manner. If theologians say, as for instance Cardenas, and Lacroix, and Zaccaria, and Bouix do, that doctrinal decrees of the Sacred Congregations, when *specially* approved by the Pope, are *ex cathedra* definitions, this doctrine, in order to be reconciled with that of the Vatican Council, must be understood in its only true sense to mean that, in such a case, such decrees should be *so specially* approved by the Pope, as to be made by him his own, in such sense that he himself would be the author of any decree so promulgated, and the Congregations' part in it would be nothing more than that of having been consulted. As to what is said, that the Pontiff confirmed the letter by his *supreme* authority, it must be borne in mind that his authority may be termed supreme either in the *intensity of its exercise*, or in its *substance*—*sive intensione exercitii sive in sua substantia*,—as the distinction has it; in the

former sense, not in the latter, does it imply infallibility, and it is evidently in the latter sense, not in the former, that it is here applied. But, it is urged, Cardinal Patrizi expressly said that the Louvain question was *defined* by this decree. Yes, to be sure, but he does *not* say by a definition *ex cathedra*. The Cardinal evidently means that the question which had been for years under consideration was at length brought to a close and put an end to by the authority of universal doctrinal provision. The professors most concerned in the matter were perfectly right in believing and saying that this was no *ex cathedra* definition, although they were very wrong in asserting that it was a disciplinary decision, and not a doctrinal one.

Having shown that Cardinal Patrizi's official letter was not an *ex cathedra* definition, it remains for us to prove that intellectual submission was due to the substance of it. The doctrines and opinions of the professor are declared unsafe; and are therefore to be thought so, and not to be taught. It is true that some thought that by this utterance silence was enjoined, and nothing more, nothing about the doctrine itself. Soon, however, they were made see their great mistake; for, in August of the same year, Cardinal Patrizi wrote on the subject, in the Holy Father's name, to the Belgian bishops, these words, which are of the utmost weight, for our end:—"It is *the duty* of Catholics, and much more so of Ecclesiastics, to submit themselves fully, perfectly, and absolutely to the decrees of the Holy See, and to do away with all contentions which would be *incompatible with the sincerity of their assent*." These are almost the very words of our thesis, and, consequently, proceeding from such a source, prove and confirm it admirably. Furthermore, the professors in question were *ordered* to sign a formula then given, and "all did sign it with most praiseworthy obedience, in December of the same year." The formula, a very important and imperative one, was as follows:—"In compliance with your orders, I hasten to offer you this written testimony of my filial *obedience*, and I most humbly entreat you to lay it at the feet of our Most Holy Father, Pope Pius IX. *I fully, perfectly, and absolutely submit myself to the decisions of the Apostolic See*, issued the 2nd of March and 30th of August of this year, and *I agree with them in my convictions*. Therefore, *I heartily* condemn and reject any opposite doctrine." No one who looks carefully and candidly into the matter will come to regard these decisions as *ex cathedra* definitions; and, nevertheless, it is as clear as the light of day, that full, perfect, and absolute submission was due to them,—a submission of the intellect, no doubt, as the language evidently implies, and as the terms "*ex animo acquiesco*," and "*ex corde*

reprobo," expressly state. The learned Louvain professors understood the decisions in their true sense, and, in a most praiseworthy manner, did their *duty*, by subjecting their strong intellects to them.

III. For our next argument in support of our theological principle, we shall refer to three documents, which are much of a similar nature. The Bishop of Strasburg, in accordance with the wishes of Gregory XVI., requested M. Bautain, of Strasburg seminary, to subscribe, and, by so doing, attest his assent, to certain propositions drawn up for him, and M. Bautain did so in 1840. The Sacred Congregation of the Index, with the approval of Pius IX., exacted a similar act of submission, by signature likewise, from the learned Bonnetty, in 1855. Neither of these formally undersigned documents is an *ex cathedra* utterance, or has ever been thought to be one; still, it is certain, and the full account of each case leaves no room for doubt on the matter, that intellectual submission, and not merely respectful silence, was claimed by, and was due to, both one and the other. It would be nothing short of revolting to Catholic feeling to suppose that Messrs. Bautain and Bonnetty, whilst signing their names as they were required, were not bound in conscience to submit their minds to the doctrine to which they subscribed. If they were not, the action of venerable authority in their regard would be nothing more than a glaring encouragement of intolerable hypocrisy, which it is too absurd even to imagine.

The third document which we here notice is a letter which Pius IX. addressed in June, 1857, to Cardinal Geissel, Archbishop of Cologne, concerning a decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Index, which proscribed the works of Antony Günther. The decree referred to, like so many others, was not an *ex cathedra* definition, even though issued at the express command and with the confirmation of the Sovereign Pontiff. Still, the letter of Pius IX. asserts that the decree was quite sufficient to oblige all Catholics to believe, not only that the doctrine put forward in these works could not be defended and upheld, but that it could not be considered in itself as being at all a true and tenable doctrine. The language of Pius IX. expresses the very conclusion which we wish to draw, and renders further comment superfluous.

IV. We now come to consider the well-known Munich Brief, a document so telling and conclusive on our subject, that it was the only argument in support of this doctrine that Cardinal Franzelin thought it necessary to bring forward in the first edition of his work on "Tradition." In it we find the following passage:—"We give deserved praise to the men of this Congress, because, rejecting the false distinction between philo-

sophy and the philosopher, of which we have spoken in another letter, they know and have declared that all Catholics in their works are bound in conscience to obey the dogmatical decrees of the Infallible Catholic Church. And whilst we thus praise them for professing a truth which necessarily arises from the obligation of Catholic faith, we wish to believe that they did not intend to limit that obligation, which is altogether binding on Catholic teachers and writers, within the sphere of those matters only *which are proposed by the Church's infallible judgment, as dogmata of faith to be believed by all*. And we are persuaded likewise that they did not mean to declare that the perfect adhesion towards revealed truths, which they have acknowledged as altogether necessary for achieving true progress in the sciences, and for refuting error, can be obtained, *if faith and obedience be given only to the dogmata expressly defined by the Church*. For, even if there were question of that subjection which is to be yielded by an act of divine faith, that should not be confined to matters defined by express decrees of Œcumenical Councils, or of the Roman Pontiffs and of this Apostolic See, but should also be extended to all that is taught as divinely revealed by the ordinary magisterium of the whole Church spread throughout the world, and which, therefore, is held by the universal and common consent of theologians as belonging to the faith. But since there is question of that *subjection whereby all Catholics are bound in conscience*, who apply themselves to the speculative sciences, in order that by their writings they may produce fresh benefits for the Church; the men of this Congress *should*, therefore, acknowledge that it is not enough for educated Catholics to receive and venerate the forementioned dogmata, but that it is also necessary that they *submit themselves both to the doctrinal decisions which are issued by the Pontifical congregations and to those points of doctrine which are held by the common and constant consent of Catholics as theological truths and conclusions*, so certain that, although the opinions opposed to these same points of doctrine cannot be called heretical, still they deserve some other theological censure.”*

It has been asserted that in this Brief there is no question at all about any congregational decisions, except those which are strictly infallible, as being *ex cathedra* definitions; and although the language of the document on this point is very

* We may refer our readers to a comment on this part of the Munich Brief which appeared in our number for July, 1871, pp. 148-152. That comment issues substantially in the same conclusions with those maintained in the text.

clear indeed, and easily understood, still we must notice the statements which have been made to uphold the strange assertion. The Sovereign Pontiff, it has been said, speaks first of all of revealed dogmata, and when he mentions decisions emanating from Pontifical congregations, he means *ex cathedra* definitions, to which every Catholic is bound to tender absolute assent,—to the first class of truths under pain of incurring the censure of heresy, to the second class under pain of incurring some censure of a less formidable character. It has been alleged that this is still further shown from the fact that these judgments of Pontifical congregations are mentioned in connection with “those points of doctrine which are held by the common and constant consent of Catholics as theological truths and conclusions, so certain that although the opinions opposed to these same points of doctrine cannot be called heretical, still they deserve some other theological censure”; and on these points it is acknowledged that Suarez and others declare the consenting Church to be infallible. Nay, it is even objected, that what we deem the one clear and natural sense of the letter of Pius IX. to the Archbishop of Munich cannot be the genuine one, because theologians teach that mental assent can be exacted only by an infallible definition; and Cardinal Gotti, in particular, it is said, denies our principle, since he teaches that although congregational decrees should be looked on as of importance, and exact external obedience; still, taken in themselves as issued by the Congregation, they do not furnish the theologian with a firm and reliable proof of the doctrine which they inculcate.

We shall speak of the teaching of theologians, and of Cardinal Gotti in particular, with reference to our subject, in due course; and here we shall be satisfied with doing away with the other futile objections brought against the substance of the Brief.

We answer first of all, in a general manner, by asking at the outset with Cardinal Franzelin, Who could ever believe that “decisions which are issued by Pontifical Congregations” should comprise *none* of those issued by the congregations themselves, and *only* those that are issued by the Sovereign Pontiff, teaching *ex cathedra*? No doubt congregational decisions are often termed decisions of the Holy See, because it is from the Holy See that the congregations hold their jurisdiction and teaching authority, as its organs and members exercised for universal pastoral and doctrinal provision. No doubt, the decrees too are often called Pontifical, inasmuch as the Pope ratifies and confirms them by his supreme authority. But it is a thing unheard-of, and it is altogether at variance with the style of the Curia, that an *ex cathedra* definition should be designated as a decision issued by a Pontifical congregation.

Not only is this statement stripped of any force by being out of keeping with the custom and language of the Curia; a full consideration and clear understanding of the Brief itself and of its tenour makes it quite untenable. The Brief lays down three distinct classes of decisions that come forth from the Holy See, as we have done, and specifies, as we have done, though not in quite the same language, the nature of the assent due to each respectively. First of all, we see pointed out "the dogmatical decrees of the Infallible Catholic Church," the truths "which are proposed by the Church's infallible judgment as dogmata of faith to be believed by all," "the dogmata expressly defined by the Church." To all such decrees as these "faith and obedience" are due, faith properly and immediately divine to revealed truths, defined as such, and faith mediately divine to other truths, not revealed, but connected with others that are revealed, which are likewise defined by the Church's infallible authority. The members of the Munich Congress acknowledged "that all Catholics are bound in conscience to obey the dogmatical decrees of the Infallible Catholic Church." The Sovereign Pontiff praises them for this declaration; but supposes that they did not intend to limit the obligation of Catholics to the sphere of such decrees, and expressly asserts that it would not be enough. "For even if there were question of the subjection which is to be yielded by an act of divine faith, that should not be confined to matters defined by express decrees, . . . but should be extended to all that is taught as divinely-revealed by the ordinary magisterium of the whole Church." But the present question is not about "the subjection which is to be yielded by an act of divine faith," whether immediately or mediately divine, to the pronouncements to which such an act is due. The real question at issue concerns "that subjection whereby all Catholics are bound in conscience, who apply themselves to the speculative sciences"; and Pius IX. answers the question admirably in this way:—"The men of this Congress *should*, therefore, acknowledge that it is *not* enough for educated Catholics to receive and venerate the forementioned dogmata, but that it is also *necessary* that they submit themselves both to the *doctrinal decisions which are issued by the Pontifical Congregations*, and to those points of doctrine which are held by the common and constant consent of Catholics as theological truths and conclusions." The "theological truths and conclusions" here spoken of are not truths and conclusions defined as such by the infallible authority, but truths and conclusions which are held as such "by the common and constant consent of Catholics," and which are "so certain, that although the opinions opposed to these points of doctrine cannot be called heretical, still they deserve

some other theological censure." Religious assent, consequently, and not assent of divine faith, is due to these truths and conclusions; and therefore, instead of inferring that the doctrinal decisions mentioned in connection with them are *ex cathedra* definitions, the logical and truth-seeking mind should naturally be led to a different inference.

We deem it then unquestionable that there is a marked distinction made in the Brief between the congregational decrees of which we speak, and utterances which are *ex cathedra*, bearing with them the formal sanction of infallible authority; and this being once laid down, it is matter of small difficulty to show how the Brief expressly teaches that intellectual assent is due to these doctrinal decisions. The Sovereign Pontiff teaches that perfect adhesion towards revealed truths *cannot* be obtained if faith and obedience be given *only* to the dogmata expressly defined by the Church. Faith and obedience are also due to all that is taught as divinely revealed by the ordinary magistratum of the whole Church; and, to ensure that *perfect adhesion* to revealed truths, Catholics are bound in conscience to *submit* themselves to the decisions of Pontifical Congregations, and to other undefined theological truths and conclusions. The end for which the submission is declared *necessary*, viz., to ensure *perfect adhesion* to revealed truths, proves that, if the necessary means are to be in keeping with, and in proportion to, the end, the submission to congregational decisions so requisite must be intellectual, since the *perfect adhesion* to revealed truths, since the act of divine faith, is an intellectual act. Furthermore, the same submission is said to be required for these decisions as for the theological truths and conclusions mentioned in connection with them; and since it is beyond doubt that *mental* submission should be tendered in the one case, it follows that the assent to be given in the other should be mental likewise. Our adversary says that the Brief does require intellectual subjection to the pronouncements of which it speaks; but as he takes them to be *ex cathedra* declarations, he should naturally claim for them an intellectual subjection which would involve an act of mediately divine faith, not merely the *religious* submission of mind which, as is openly stated, all Catholics are bound in conscience to offer to decrees of Sacred Congregations, which are not *ex cathedra* definitions.

These important documents, taken singly or taken collectively, seem to us to establish the doctrine embodied in our thesis in the most decisive manner. It remains for us to consider a third class of arguments drawn from the doctrine of theologians on our subject. To this task we shall apply ourselves in a future article, as space does not permit us to give

in the present, as we expressly intended at the outset, the full treatment of this division of the subject, and of the portion which is to come after it. However we shall continue it with interest in the coming number. First, we shall show, as if by a negative proof, that the doctrine of some theologians, such as Suarez, Bellarmine, and Gotti, which has been said to be opposed to our teaching, is fully in harmony with it, and even something more. Then we shall adduce arguments of a really positive character, by showing how the doctrine of our thesis has been held by theologians in general, and especially by Zaccaria, Gregory XVI., and Benedict XIV., who may justly be regarded on the matter as organs of the entire Teaching Church.

ART. X.—THE CONFLICT BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE.

The Republic of Plato, translated by HENRY DAVIS. London: Bohn. 1849.

The Politics of Aristotle, translated by EDWARD WALFORD. London: Bohn. 1853.

Latter-Day Pamphlets. By THOMAS CARLYLE (New Edition). London: Chapman & Hall. 1872.

Letters on a Regicide Peace. By EDMUND BURKE. London. 1796.

Saggio del Dritto Naturale di Luigi Taparelli. Roma. 1855.

IN many a biting phrase has Mr. Carlyle expressed his contempt for the "inarticulate shrieking," as he calls it, into which historians, orthodox or merely conservative, have broken out over the French Revolution. It will scarcely be conceded that he has set them a better example. But we think the rebuke is merited. Not as though the years 1789 and 1793 were not fatal and doomed to have a black stone set against them for ever in the chronicles of Europe. Mr. Carlyle himself is witness that the downfall brought about in those melancholy days was tragic indeed: he, too, has reminded us of the Virgilian pathos that lingers in the thought of them; "*Sunt lacrymæ rerum et mentem mortalia tangunt.*" Nor has any one else chosen so grand and striking a manner of narrating how the nether deeps burst up to overwhelm the whole fair fabric of human life, how fiery floods melted the long-standing foundations that dated back to Roman ages, and how for a time

there hung over gods and men the twilight or dusk of doom which, in northern Sagas, is to end all things except relentless Fate. He would proclaim, in accordance with the old philosopher, that so lamentable a tragedy must purify by pity and terror, nor would he desire that men whom it had thus affected should sink after a moment or two into easy indifference. But his complaint is that the moderns have undergone no purification. In watching the overthrow of kings, and the splendid horror of battles, they have forgotten to study the eternal and religious meaning of all that has come to pass. They have depicted the change as a Revolution, but care not to interpret their own word; and whereas a genuine revolution dethrones the social creed and establishes another in its place, they appear to think that it is only the Germanic Empire or the Republic of Venice that has gone its way, and they have glorified the Congress of Vienna—so long as its provisions continued in force—until innocent readers imagine that the victories gained over Napoleon I. and the collective wisdom of Talleyrand, Metternich, and Castlereagh undid all that the Jacobins had accomplished. These are the men to praise Edmund Burke for his sagacity and to conclude that because he foresaw the natural consequences of 1789, he thereby hindered them from being carried out. It would surprise them to be told that Waterloo was many years too late, and that the Congress of Vienna did homage to the new France and affixed its sign-manual to the Regicide Peace. But Mr. Carlyle has known this ever since he wrote his history of the Revolution, and what excites his scorn is that the multitude of writers will perceive only the ruin of an ancient civilization when they should be thinking how their own, that they complacently admire, is the second, the constructive stage of that very movement they condemn. The eighteenth century has given birth to the nineteenth; both must be viewed as holding the same principles and aiming at one ideal of perfection. Root and stem and branch they are a great and growing tree; the modern Ygdrasil that rises out of unseen depths and towers upwards to Heaven. He, therefore, that would fell the tree must look to the root: if he would convert the nineteenth century, he must bethink himself of a method that will refute its predecessor.

For what was the Revolution but "victorious analysis," a critical power unequalled in boldness and irreverence, questioning Church and State, morality and religion, science and art, and finding them each and all convicted of absurdity at its tribunal? But there can exist no criticism in which positive beliefs are not somewhere hidden. Nor did the Revolution deny that it cherished a faith of its own and was bent on a

definite policy. From the cannon's-mouth it roared in the ears of Europe metaphysical formulæ on the Rights of Man, the Sovereignty of Reason and of the People, Liberty and Equality, and a thousand other articles declared to be of prime necessity if mankind was ever destined to a "Golden Year." The Jacobins showed themselves ardent and hopeful, not because a beautiful creation of the past was shrivelled into nothing, but because they felt nearer, every day, to the realizing of that world for which, when seen in vision, they had passionately longed. The fire they kindled, says Carlyle, was a funeral-pyre, but of the phoenix that by-and-by should soar up from its ashes into the clear heaven, perfect in form and voice. This they certainly desired. They wrought not sheerly from hate, but even more from a fanatical love of the abstraction they invoked as Humanity. And, however little they sometimes can have known what principles were guiding them, they yet conformed to a theory all the elements of which had been fully discussed and accepted by the most polished society in Europe, before a finger anywhere was raised against the supreme authorities.

If, then, we must shed tears, let us, first, as Carlyle advises, learn the greatness of the calamity we have to deplore. The shows of things are transient:—taking of the Bastille, assault on the Tuileries, beheading of King and Queen, these dreadful pageants we may look upon and pass by. For the chief concern of man is not about accidents of this nature, but rather about spiritual convictions, the highest good, truth and virtue, self-denying love, purity, courage, and resignation. And we say that the change to be wept over began and its authors had won great victories before the Revolution, when only some foreboding heart, like Christophe de Beaumont's, knew that a judgment was coming. Furthermore, it is pure weakness of intellect, or prejudice, or sophistry that blinds us to the connection between our present modes of thought and those of a hundred years ago. We are, most of us, in our innermost soul, contemporaries of Kant and Voltaire. But, of course, we do not reckon earnest Catholics in the modern society that is here contemplated. Catholics, like the Church, belong to no century. Their creed is unchanging, and they fear no Revolution; they can live without the world, though the world hazards an experiment when it tries to live without them. But of this hereafter. We give it as probable in itself and as resting on well-known facts, that what Burke has described as "the armed doctrine of the Jacobins," was extant before 1789, and has since then become the implied basis of our political and social order, not to the entire exclusion of other doctrines more

worthy to be approved, but in such wise that the prevailing complexion of society is anti-christian and even atheistic. For it seems that we ought to distinguish only two possible methods of directing mankind, whether we consider the individual by himself or the associations of which he is a member. One way requires that the Living Personal God should receive acknowledgment, worship, and prayer: the other, denying that this is a matter of any moment, treats God as not even a legal fiction, as at best a necessary notion in metaphysics, and forms the citizen and the State without reference to the Supreme Good as identified with God, or to the future life of the soul. If this be the modern method, see what follows.

It will in such a case be almost axiomatic that the Church and the governments (with the doubtful exception of England, and perhaps Spain) are hopelessly at odds, and that they can never come to a sincere agreement unless one or other of the parties suffer a change of principles, and become what Scripture calls "a new creation." The governments must submit to baptism, or the Church, by proving unfaithful to God, must relinquish her office of teaching the truth, and, as a necessary sequel, must perish altogether. For the religion of atheism has hitherto not assumed a tangible shape. Only a complete revolution in thought and feeling can give peace to the world. Such changes we see little reason to anticipate as yet; the dawnings of hope that we can trace in the sky are very faint; nor would we altogether trust them. It is more consonant with the tone of present literature and with social habits and tendencies, to hold that a long conflict is still to be fought, and that troubles are likely to thicken in the course of the next few years. But here, at all events, is a master-key to the problems that so confuse our public life—if we have the skill to apply it. Theocracy or no theocracy, is that indeed the question? And must we hold that forms of government—monarchies, aristocracies, republics—are but of small consequence, and merit only the second place in our attention, compared with the spirit of the laws, and, above all, with their religious bearings? We must certainly, unless it pleases us to imagine that virtue is inherent in one or other constitution of the State, which would mean that we put faith in the dead machinery, and strangely invert the relations of higher and lower. For it is not the organism that gives life to the soul, but the soul that, by indwelling, enables the organism to move and feel. And long political experience is now teaching the modern writers what a like experience taught the keenest and wisest of ancient critics, (for on this point Aristotle and Plato agree,) that every sound form of go-

vernment may sink into a tyranny, since a machine composed of living units can not act independently of them, but does, in fact, need to be worked by them in mutual harmony. Whence in the Republic and in the Politics we find a theory of how to educate the citizens, that being the sole method of securing prosperity to the nation at large. For when men combine themselves into a society, they are not kept together, like bees or the other political animals, by a constraining instinct; and if it is fear of brute violence that compels them, we call such a union tyrannical and contrary to reason. But if in forming a common life they act as nature prompts, then it is clear that some apprehension of a universal good to be obtained, and some united wish to obtain it, has urged them on. We need not prove that, since men enjoy the light of reason, and are, before all things, of spiritual essence, their associating together is chiefly an agreement in the same theoretical view or belief, and in a practical intention to realize it so far as may suit their condition. Every State must live in a vision of some common truth, or what is taken to be the truth; and by how much the truth is disputed amongst citizens, and their earnest and fundamental convictions differ, by so much has the State degenerated from its ideal, and begun to decline towards anarchy.

This is what Plato has signified in his discourse concerning philosophers and kings. He would persuade us that civilization, in whatever degree it subsists, is always instinct with a theory, and supposes an ideal type of human nature to be somewhere given. And he would conclude that society governed only by opinion, and ignorant of the living truth, can never hope for beatitude, or the social perfection.

* Unless philosophers govern in States, or those that are at present called kings and rulers philosophize after a genuine fashion and sufficiently, and both philosophy and political power unite in one, there will be no end to the miseries of States, nor, indeed, to those of mankind; nor, until then, will the perfect government come into existence, or see the light of the sun. [For] the State can never otherwise be happy, except as portrayed by painters that employ a divine pattern. Such men, as they proceed in their work, will frequently look in two directions—not only to what is naturally just, and beautiful, and temperate, and the like, but also, again, to that which they can establish amongst mankind, blending and compounding their human form out of different human characters and pursuits, drawing from what Homer calls the divine likeness subsisting among men.

This magnificent speculation is founded, of course, on the belief that society aims at the highest good, which, we think, the founders of the old European system likewise held, and declares that authority, taken in its whole extent, has far

more sacred duties than to keep the peace and collect taxes. Hence the science of the politician is not to carry on an intricate diplomacy abroad, and to manufacture and preserve a majority in the parliament at home, but to discern in all the particulars that make up society what is just and equitable, what is the rational or (as we may say) the divine element in them, and how the good in private and public life may be nurtured till it grows up into perfection. Society is man "writ large," and if the purpose of man's sojourning in this world be to discover and fulfil the likeness of God that is in him, to bring all his faculties and appetites into a beautiful harmony, so that each in its degree may manifest the divine image, and all may be subject to reason enlightened, strengthened, and sustained from on high, it follows that society must put before itself the very same purpose, and must give forth to view the moral glory of which the seeds and the beginnings are hidden within it. And any society that cherishes a lower hope than this, if it professes to have the supreme final authority amongst men, is a perversion of nature, and falls short of what was intended by the Framer of things Himself.

But when we turn from Plato, and gaze abroad upon the social order that has arisen since 1814, our first temptation is to say we have been betrayed into dreaming, or else that the Greek word we translate by politics must have meant something else. We are living under a system that is not altogether peaceful, but shows itself strong by reason of its military resources, of the anxious loyalty that marks the middle classes or *bourgeoisie*, of the conservatism of peasant-proprietors, as in France, and of the passive obedience to which Christians, high and low, are for the most part pledged. Society may rest on a firm basis in spite of invading anarchy. But governments, it would appear, set before themselves no divine pattern. They declare a fixed neutrality towards all creeds and opinions, except those that touch upon immediate practical interests: for the laws enacted they seek only the sanction of expediency, and appeal neither to God nor to revealed religion. And hence the individual, however ardently he may will what is right and just, must learn by his own effort and as best he can for what end he has been thrown into a strange and perplexing world. He finds himself "amid dim lights and tangled circumstances"; and need not wonder if his life seems "mere inconsistency and formlessness," for where is the coherent social faith and order that can perform for his soul the function of knowledge?

But surely, it may be said, the Christian less than any man will concede to governments a teaching office. Plato, and even

Aristotle, looked upon society as one simple organism; they divided not between Church and State; nor would they have granted that individuals, as such, had any indefeasible or God-given rights. In their view the larger half of mankind were "servile by nature," incapable of freedom and of exercising a share in the sovereignty; and the free were members of an oligarchy, apart from which they had no dignity to be revered. Would Catholics agree with a rising school of Liberal politicians that the State can claim absolute allegiance, in thought and deed, from all within its borders?

No: we keep in mind the bull *Unam Sanctam*, and have no other wish than that its doctrines may find acceptance in Europe. True enough that Pagan philosophers could not but regard each particular society as at once Church and State, for they never knew the counsels of God that, in the fulness of the ages, a universal Church should bring men together into the great confederation and brotherhood that has taken possession of the world. But it is likewise true that Plato spoke of a natural resemblance of man to God, and that the social reason, as we may call it, has its own evidences, and knows, or may know, the solemn truths that Revelation presupposes, and only confirms,—does not for the first time proclaim. The State is not the Church; granted: but has not the State, as such, a duty to believe in the Moral Governor of the world, to acknowledge His law, and to set up no statutes that contravene it? Here is the pernicious mistake into which society has been deluded: it had, indeed, no rational motives to separate itself from the Christian Church: how much less can it bring forward a good or allowable defence for its apostasy from belief in God! For if God is not an empty name; if He did once create man and momentarily preserves him in life and energy; it needs no argument to prove that society is the work of God, and must pay Him due homage, worship, and reverence. The statement will not be called in question, we know; but critics who dislike it will ask us to make good that formidable If, and will cry out that their intellect fails to show them a Personal God. This, however, is beside the matter in hand: we take it as known that the spirit of man, not being infinite or wholly independent of conditions and limits, has a spiritual cause from which it derives whatever of perfection it has; and that cause is God, the Living Conscious Law of morality and truth. From this natural assumption it is easy to conclude to the Highest Good and the end or necessary aim of human society. Then, again, society is known to be an organism, and of such it is the law that every part, keeping its own function and its due distinction,

shall conduce to the good of the whole. But the act of each member, faculty, or lesser combination of parts, is to be subordinated to the general purpose and so receives a peculiar character. The eye sees and does not hear, the ear cannot see; but both alike, in performing their functions, must take the rule and measure from the nature they serve. As parts of an organism they are not mere instruments; but, again, each is not its own supreme end, and therefore they must move in harmony, obeying reason, which itself contemplates the true relations of things to God, and is bound to realize them in the domain committed to its sovereignty. Whence the State, however it be distinguished from the Church, must still keep that highest end in view; must, as Aristotle says, aid men to cultivate virtue; or, in the loftier language of Plato, must look to the divine resemblance, and, in its proper place and manner of acting, help to realize it. But when the secular power judges that its own immediate aim (suppose the development of physical, industrial, and commercial resources) is exclusively the end of man, or is not subordinate to the development of his moral and religious nature, we have a State that tends to anarchy. The case is as though a man should imagine that not reason, but passion, is to govern; or that, perhaps, each faculty may seek to gratify itself regardless of consequences to the others. It is against so hideous a discord that Plato inveighs; and though the Revolution would not admit his doctrine, that man should resemble God, yet it would insist upon the other principle asserted, that society, taken altogether, seeks a supreme and rational good, and that only the brutes can associate for simply physical or industrial ends. And Mr. Carlyle has done little in his studies of history but eloquently denounce the notion that men and beavers make the same kind of society, and that we may abstract from the moral relations when our end, considered in itself and immediately, is temporal profit or pleasure.

Nor do Liberal politicians deny in so many words the text of Plato. They are, indeed, loth to bind themselves by declaring what they believe: whence it has been plausibly urged that they believe nothing, but, like the ancient Academy, deal in probabilities, opinions, and mere shadows of doctrine. However, when they can be brought to book, their way is to profess deep respect for the religious convictions of every church or sect, and then to argue that their duty as statesmen is simple neutrality. In granting so much, they do not perceive that the neutrality becomes conditional, and must be given up when religion suffers by it. For this is common ground between them and us, that the secular power has no right so to prosecute its

end as to hinder men from attaining their absolute perfection—which is something divine and immortal, and not of this world. But does not such an admission carry with it all for which we are contending? Religious truth is allowed a negative, but real supremacy; it is said, "The State has no legitimate power of acting to the prejudice of religion, whether natural or supernatural." (For a neutral statesman cannot, *ex hypothesi*, declare that revelation is absurd or has never been vouchsafed.) Now, this negative supremacy will turn out to be positive, if duly examined. For what does reason tell us? not that lower activities are ordered so as to leave the higher free, but that they aid in perfecting the whole nature, and have an instrumental office towards the higher. Else an organism would possess no intrinsic unity, nor would the parts correspond to their definition, for they should be not only ends but means. And analogies without number in the kingdoms of physical life enforce the same lesson: viz., that an organic combination is much more than bare adjustment; that it is harmonious union, where one spirit or principle interpenetrates and governs the whole, and gives, as we said before, a new and higher excellence to all the parts, without abolishing their immediate or formal objects and functions. But, perhaps, it is enough to point out that the negative supremacy of religion, admitted hitherto on all sides, is a deduction from principles that justify and require its positive supremacy as well. For the reason of both is that human society must be organic and hierarchical, and that the more excellent an end is in itself the wider does its sovereignty become. So that if religion is a good that includes, and, so to speak, transcends mere morality, and if it be clear in itself that the moral law is, of necessity, a rule for every human association, we have hereby established what the moderns question or deny, that the government of states and development of civilization should result in a true Theocracy.

Aristotle warns us against seeking the most complete unity in a living combination. Nor shall we venture to represent by one formula the complicated facts and opinions that constitute our modern Europe. But a prevailing tendency always is discoverable; especially when we ask what, on the whole, society dreams about religion. And, surely, the Treaty of Vienna did but roll a great stone to the mouth of the sepulchre in which Christendom lay dead. Surely, with a dreadful and constant purpose, the spirit that a hundred years ago showed himself in fire has now, changing his form, brought kings and parliaments to serve him as though he were the good God, wisdom at once and strength. Can even Burke have foreseen that a day would come—and yet it is here, and we are living

through it—when sacred laws themselves, and the crowned authority of State, and received tradition, and elementary teaching should have bestowed sanctity and supremacy upon the creed against which, like Pericles, he thundered and lightened? Lately words have been quoted from him that seem to contain a prophecy. After saying that the Revolution in France “bears little resemblance to those that have been brought about in Europe on principles merely political,” he adds,—

It is a revolution of doctrine and theoretic dogma. It has a much greater resemblance to those changes which have been made on religious grounds—in which a spirit of proselytism makes an essential part. . . . Questions of theoretic truth and falsehood are not governed by circumstances any more than by places.

He enlarges on the similarity of character, which further reflection has proved to be an identity, in the Reformation and the Revolution.* And elsewhere he has written the famous passage which some so often quote, that—

If a great change is to be made in human affairs, the minds of men will be fitted to it, the general opinions and feelings will draw that way. Every fear, every hope will forward it.

But hardly can he have dreamt that the Revolution would, eighty years after his death, be proceeding “by due course of law.”

It is not clear to us whether Burke was fully aware of the connection between “Jacobin doctrines” and the philosophic and polite literature that, during the entire reign of Louis XV., was held in honour. To German speculation he must have been a stranger, nor would he have busied himself much with Rousseau, for instance, and the French school of passionate reformers. On the other hand, Goethe, as is well known, blamed the authors of 1789 and 1793 for having *thrown back* the movement to which they were devoted. So keen a remark demonstrates that, like the genius he was, he had pierced into the depths of the new philosophy, and recognized by what methods it could best be propagated. The convulsive shock did nothing but destroy life: he had preferred a slower expedient of success, and one that might help towards keeping the life in, whilst it was undergoing transformation. But here we are reminded of “Medea and old Æson,” the common mind thinks that for every change from decrepitude to youth a fiery caldron and hacking of life to pieces is indispensable. Goethe, judging otherwise, sighed for the exquisite methods of Lessing and

* “Thoughts on French Affairs.”

Voltaire. He knew it was a question, not of institutions, but of ideals. But he did not imagine that men would shake off the influence of "the enlightened century"; the Platonic number, fatal to human policies, was now fulfilled, and "*Magnum ab integro sæclorum nascitur ordo.*" That established régime against which, as the author of Goetz and Werther, he had so chafed, was ruined from top to bottom; and in gross phrase or with excess of deprecating refinement, the world, as he saw, was taking in a new kind of Evangel, preached, not in the churches, but in fashionable speaking and writing, in books of abstruse philosophy, in poetry, and in the current journals of European great cities.

The mighty spirits, "who, though dead, still rule us from their urns," and upon whom Christian Churches are making war, did all of them, we say, agree that society must be carried on, as if God were a fiction. But the clearest of them flung away in disdain the imbecile pretence of neutrality, which average politicians think their best safeguard. Society could not be neutral towards God, because, as they declared, after Plato, a true analogy passes between the individual man and the social organism. Now, in their eyes, man was a law to himself, had no superior to whom he owed reverence or fealty, and, though not immortal, was sovereign over his own actions and destiny. This lies at the root of their "political dogma," as Burke describes it, that,—

The majority, told by the head, of the taxable people in every country, is the perpetual, natural, unceasing, indefeasible sovereign: that this majority is perfect master of the form, as well as the administration of the State: and that the magistrates, under whatever names they are called, are only functionaries to obey the orders (general as laws, or particular as decrees) which that majority may make; that this is the only natural government; that all others are tyranny and usurpation.

It is the complete freedom, or lawlessness, of the man that gives rise to the sovereign power of the citizen; for, if each is his own keeper, then he merely *abdicates* whatever prerogative ceases upon his entrance into society. Hence the Social Contract, which, not only in France, but in Liberal countries generally, is understood to have originated present institutions—and which might, in consequence, bring them to an end. Hence, too, the theory of Kant, that authority is intended merely to prevent collisions between the sovereign units out of which society has come, and that the State is a system of warfare disguised under the semblance of peace. That every man may go his own way, indulge his own humour, and ruin his prosperity and his prospects together, is a recognized doctrine: provided,

however,—and this is included in the very statement of each man's liberty,—that no one interfere with his neighbour, or curtail in him that glorious privilege of obeying his vices which he himself enjoys. Modern society, we repeat, is founded on this notion of man's nature; and, as a matter of course, supposes it everywhere, encourages it, gives large facility for making it a truth, if it is not one, and publicly consecrates its licentious and profane results.

And, if the type of government does but magnify the type of individual, it follows that between this and the ideal polity and individual of Theism, there can be no reconciliation, but only a constant strife. Moreover, if atheism has come to be established—we say it frankly—Theism will aim at its overthrow. Changes are in themselves neither desirable nor undesirable; they must be considered in the light of what they effect; and because men have set up an atheistic scheme of government and of private life, it will never be said that we should acquiesce, fold our hands and do nothing. Catholics condemn the Revolution, because it was, not a going on to perfection, but a going back to perdition. And they propose to employ all just and lawful measures, to change what is bad in modern Europe by preaching and persuading the eternal truths of God's governance and man's subjection. They will not look on political atheism as “an accomplished fact,” nor will grant that by prescription and lapse of time it can be rendered sacred. No laws are binding on the conscience but such as are moral; no constitution of society is legitimate that defeats the very end which society is ordained, immediately or remotely, to compass.

What then is the ideal which the eighteenth century proposed as perfect, which the Revolution adored, and present society is realizing in public as in private life? Its regulative or forming principle is atheism—for by this plain term we are bound to designate, not only the denial of the Infinite and Spiritual Creator, but the studious neglect of Him, or refusal to decide whether He has claims on our homage. For, whichever of these courses be taken, the consequences are alike. God, the unknowable, to whom we feel we have no obligations, can, at most, but surround our life with mystery: He never will become the object of virtues like Faith, Hope, Charity, Reverence, nor will He furnish us with a rule of practical conduct. For sceptic indifference (which so many now regard as plausible, or even a duty) lays it down that were there a living Infinite, distinct from man and the visible universe, He could have no relation to us, and that we can have none to Him. Whence our intellect looks not beyond the finite, and our will terminates in what is truly a creature and a second cause.

What follows is remarkable enough. In every science and art that is not instrumental, we come sooner or later to a symbol of the Infinite and the Absolute, to something that our reason apprehends as mystery, a truth not to be exhausted by us. What can be the explanation of this? All our knowledge seems to suggest more than it brings out. Science and art have the air of a parable, and we are driven to search for the key to it. Now such as believe in God readily accept the Platonic account, given by the divine philosopher in that very treatise on the perfect state from which we have quoted, and are convinced that the shadow of the first and best is faintly perceptible over and in all our knowledge; and hence that created realities have an eternal meaning in the wisdom of God. To borrow a noble phrase, though not its application, from Spinoza, the Theist views his own life and the world about him and all that can happen to him, "*sub specie æternitatis*." He knows that least things and great are more than they seem, that the First Cause, being pure, undivided, and spiritual, abides in His creatures always, and works Himself all the works that they likewise put forth. The Divine presence is like a boundless open air, in which all things move and have their liberty, or like the light of an unchanging day, that sheds glory on every side, and makes the prospect as beautiful as it is wide and far-reaching. So that the art and science of life, which is Ethics, does not bring the spirit under a dominion foreign to its nature, such as would correspond with abstract rules, formulæ complete in themselves, and empty laws, but into the sanctuary of life and before the throne of the All-Seeing; and every commandment issues from His mouth, and He is the pattern we must imitate. Moreover, the symbol of the Infinite expresses, though in parable, that highest One Who is beauty, love, holiness, strength, wisdom. That is why our knowledge is ever beginning, and why with Augustine we rejoice in our ignorance. For we hold that visible things came to be by reason of God's fulness, and that the eternal depths are not a fearful nothingness and vacuity, but life self-possessed and for ever blessed. Art that is engaged with divine meanings in whatever it depicts,—speculative science that cannot rest because the finite veils rather than discloses the eternal truth,—life that looks onward to the perfection of immortal beatitude,—these are the sources of that enduring hope which makes all sorrow easy to be borne, all enterprises possible to be achieved.

But when the living Infinite is to us as though He were not, the universe (and we along with it) ceases to have an everlasting worth. It is by a secret impulse of reason that those who

deny God cannot bear to believe in the immortality of man. Henceforth they know only finite realities and an abstract symbol which stands for nothing. Their mysteries are thick darkness into which light never came. Secondary causes, losing their hold on the sustaining energy of God, threaten to vanish into an abyss. The world is grown airy and unsubstantial, like a piece of music whose meaning, as some would have us think, lies in the ear of the listener. And since nought is known but the false infinitude that results from taking its sign for the thing signified, we get a narrowness, frivolity, and impotence in art, gross reality as a beast may see it, or ghostly dreaming which can neither enlighten nor warm us. At the best, a fine spirit, such as Goethe, will present to the spectator a vision of the world in its organic life and unity, but like a beautiful many-flowering plant that has no root, and is decaying as fast as it blooms. He will write "failure" as the last word of all his poems, and will weary the student with minute dissection and combination and the mimic life thence resulting. For the source of life he cannot know. By the same law and the same process, science will renounce her definitions and primary self-evident truths, will fall away into monotonous experimenting or the registration of interminable facts. But the science of conduct or of the supreme perfection, without which society cannot long endure, will suffer the chief loss. For what can it propose as a standard and ideal? not the Infinite God, but a sum of finite goods, the satisfying of many desires by hunting after a troop of pleasures and delights. Nay, if we seek to cultivate the virtues, they will bring no true perfection, because the life and significance have gone out of them. Plato has reasonably said that such morality is an art of computation, an arithmetic by which we add the multitudes of units together and choose the largest sum. But the Infinite is not in that collection, however cunningly we have made it. We must find the repose of perfection, not in all things, but in Him. Thus, when we take religion away from ethics, we rob morality of its essence. For conduct that is regulated by pleasure and by that alone is confessed to be sinful and mere baseness; and virtue cannot exist where we regard only what is temporal, transient, and relative; it is not in the flux of things that we can seek a standard, but only in their necessary and eternal order. And since they combine to form an ideal, the question whether we can reach a perfect state before we die is indeed to be instituted, but speedily receives its answer. A short and common experience will teach almost any man that the visible and the human, when made the final object of desire and loved simply in themselves, seem

to *shed* the good that they contain, and are as little ordained to perfect us as painted fruits to appease hunger, or imagined water-brooks to take away thirst. If the world is full of weariness and languor, we need not seek for the reason of it in some philosophy of pessimism; it is men that are to blame, not the universe or its Maker. For how can we expect to please ourselves in reading a beautiful poem when we will not be persuaded to interpret the words of it in their own language, and take a noble speech for the dialect of savages or the chattering of unintelligent birds? Created things cannot be to us the Infinite, nor can they lead us up to Him if we determine not to understand what they say. If we are to be perfect in goodness, and therefore happy, it must come about through our entering into His love and joy, Who is the absolute end that moral science has in view. None of the realities we see are the necessary and universal; nor is an abstraction worth considering unless founded upon some reality. The life that is calm and neutral towards God must look for its beatitude either in the abstract—that is to say, in empty thought—or, as we have argued already, in the sum total of its pleasures.

Much reasoning has brought us, then, to a conclusion that classical antiquity well understood. Those that held not the distinction between Creator and creature became, when virtue attracted them, Stoics, but when pleasure, Epicureans. Turn to the eighteenth century and view the ancient sects springing up to life again. Kant was noble and stern, felt that he needed only himself, and that prayer, from the heart of any one arrived at man's estate, was no better than a delusion. He dictated the law to his own nature and faculties, indulged only the highest ambitions, and in all his dealings approved himself a genuine Stoic.

But when Zeno appeared as a German philosopher, Epicurus did not linger behind in the shades. He translated his clear Greek into the cynical, polished, superficial, and persuasive style of Voltaire, broke out with Rousseau into lyrical adoration of impulsive passion, and in Goethe and Wieland discovered kindred souls in whom he must have taken more delight than in rugged Lucretius. He had never affected the philosophic pomp and gravity, nor sought the fame of an authentic teacher; it is easy to recommend happiness and to sketch from life around the manner of it. For the formal treatise he had set on one side, and betook himself to rhetoric, or the poetry of Anacreon and Horace. All his favourite modes were now, at his return, bound up like the reeds of an organ, and he heard their music again in the romances of his modern votaries. How many are there not that have written in his

praise and have filled prologue, epilogue, and all the poem with invocations of *Alma Venus* according to her many titles, from the least ignoble to the most shameful! The aim of life came to be amusement and luxury, and vice itself was astounded to find it had, unwittingly but willingly, become religion. For men have always imagined that to yield to sensuous impulses whenever they urge is morally an evil; but now they are told that, nature being good, all it can prompt the soul to do must partake of that goodness. To educate himself, it is said, is the chief, perhaps, the sole duty of each one; and to live through all phases of passion, to be all things by turns and nothing long, to throw himself heartily into the spirit of every religion and philosophy, and into the tumultuous excitement of history, joining all the schools but continuing in none, knowing all opinions, but carefully refraining from the notion that any of them is sacred or true, showing an easy tolerance, a gentle but confirmed scepticism, a silent and graceful acquiescence in what cannot be helped, this is the method and the mark of a cultured gentleman, as at Berlin so at Paris, and as in the age of Louis XV. so now. Goethe's whole teaching may seem to those who have studied him no other than this: not with Plato, to find out the divine resemblance in man and to realize it perfectly—that, he would say, is not the purpose of life—but to know that each man is his own ideal, and having fixed on our better self as an object of worship, to give ourselves up to its cultivation and thus attain the heights of a grand sovereignty, where no law is valid for us until we have ratified it. The man that has made himself, like Wilhelm Meister, "an august personage" cannot allow that his superior lives, on earth or in Heaven. He is, like the absolute Ego, his own object and subject, and the universe is only his shadow. He claims to be a deity, bestriding the earth as we have read that Julius Cæsar once was thought to do: and in the manner of Julius he considers not how soon he may fall. Death, immortality, the unseen kingdoms, he will resolutely banish from his mind, busying himself until the last with such things as have brought his genius home to him or have made it manifest to others. Sometimes, for he is human, in spite of the sovereign majesty that clothes him round, he falls into musing on what might be, if, as he cannot think, there should be an hereafter. And then the sophism—or is it really not one?—contents him again, that, since he has employed this present form of being to best advantage, and is perfectly a citizen of this world, the eternal powers will judge he has done wisely and well, and that he deserves to enter on a scene of larger scope and nobler incidents.

Readers will know that we have not coined all this out of

a logical fancy that delights in making quaint hypotheses, and in working them out as consistent dreams. We have been quoting from innumerable passages in the lives and writings of genuine Epicureans, and have but compared together what Rousseau and George Sand, and Lessing and Goethe, and even Heine and Auerbach, have wished to lay before all the world. This is not a day to seek for creeds and philosophies merely in texts of school: they are more likely to show themselves where an ancient would never have thought they could be hidden—unless he were a Plutarch—in idle romances, in fugitive songs and artificial sonnets, in conversations remembered by friends of the great men, in biographies (whether true or false, for they all instruct), and seldom, if ever, in the doctrines of the Church that baptized the founders of our new society. But what has all this in common with politics and the relations of Europe to Catholicity?

Much every way. The Pagan ideal of man would reproduce the Spartan oligarchy, and make our lower classes, in fact if not in name, Helots. Carlyle speaks for many besides himself when he says the best that could befall an average man is to live under Cromwell or Frederic II. His new Downing-street may be seen, any day, at Berlin, full of governors who decree what shall be done, without murmuring, by their patient German country-folk and town-folk; or on the French side of Metz—for the Rhine is no longer a boundary—in the central bureaus that educate, and examine, and prescribe their political opinions to the thousands of petty communities that constitute republican France. When the citizen is Stoic, either government does not exist, or a bureaucracy in the capital carries it on. And as the condition of a slave is, thanks to the Catholic faith, no longer tolerated upon European soil, there is need of some excuse for introducing it and of a name to disguise it. Hence it is that, according to the Lycurgan form, we get our modern conscription and the new praises of military renown. And, in no such long period, we shall, perhaps, witness how the organizing of citizens for war may lead to the organizing of labourers for work, and some sharp-sighted Chancellor of the Empire will defeat Socialism by restoring serfdom. The thing is not only conceivable; it seems, on certain conditions, probable; and of these the chief are, that workmen continue improvident and given to Socialistic conspiring, and that the State do not, in obedience to an entirely fresh impulse, disband its large armies and resolve upon cultivating peace instead of war. Now what is there to make the industrial classes more careful, or the State less military?

Only one cause do we see that has in it the power of producing such an effect. Of course, we mean the Roman Church; and if strangers to the faith demur, then we will add that either the Catholic religion can effect a change, or no institution that remains amongst men can do so. We have never wished to underrate the good that even separated bodies may be doing, in so far as they have kept some principles or even bare doctrines of the Christian religion; but who can reasonably look upon them as formative and life-giving systems in the world at large? If Europe is ever brought into the theocratic form of government, such a vast revolution will be due neither to an Anglican nor to a Lutheran established church; still less can we hope that "the dissidence of Dissent," which Matthew Arnold so well understands and so thoroughly despises, will prove, as by miracle, to have elicited unity out of its very discord. Some false prophet may indeed arise and draw the multitudes after him; but the true Theocracy must be looked for, if at all, as coming in consequence of the prayers, the tribulations, and the Christian heroism of Catholics holding the same divine creed and spending themselves to propagate it amongst our new heathen. That the spiritual and supreme truths require, in this world of sense and material energies, a protecting and developing organism in which they may dwell, through which their beauty may shine out upon mankind, begins to impress itself even on the worshippers of Pure Reason. Whence Comte and his disciples have set in array arguments for a social *cathedra* of first principles which the mere Liberal cannot easily dissolve. And it seems, in fact, not unreasonable that, when individuals must unite to compass the largest benefits of material riches and resources, they should be under as much necessity of combining, if they would get beyond the mere rudiments of religion and morality to the living system and heavenly world of truth in which they are destined to display the whole good that lies in humanity. But the problem how to frame a social order in which man may keep his dignity as a person, and, without sinking into an irrational instrument—the wheel of some dead but intricate machinery—may enjoy what advantage our mutual co-operation can bring, that problem we feel no human ingenuity can solve, but only Providence acting through the institution itself has made. Theism, apart from Christianity, is all but an abstract philosophy, little capable of making head against desires that grasp their object at once, and with the senses. What can simple thought avail against flesh and blood? But the Christian religion has no proper momentum or efficacy where it is dissevered from an imperial and world-embracing authority.

Its political force is shown under conditions and through a medium that puts it, so to speak, in contact with human politics. Such a contrivance is the Church, and secular statesmen never grow anxious or timid in regard to Christianity until they see it has taken a definite form, and has been concentrated round a focus. Then the spirit who is their master rouses himself, and his violence and wrath bear witness to the divine wisdom that founded a kingdom, and not a philosophic school, to convert the nations.

That the political problem far exceeds the unaided and self-sufficient intellect of the eighteenth century—which, we repeat, is yet in mid-course—admits of speedy demonstration. We have observed how Stoic and Epicurean alike declare that the perfect man—the *vir sapiens*, or cultured gentleman—is his own sovereign, ideal, and end. And they further agree that a society formed by such deities could simply result from a free contract, according to which the throned gods might surrender some of their independence in exchange for the pleasantness of living in unity. But now, when the philosopher betakes himself to concerns of the present life, he knows not where a second *sapiens* is to be looked for: mankind, in the general, seem base, wicked, and brutal. What society can they have a share in? He will tell them in good set terms that if only one wise man exists, they must expend the little sense they have in letting him rule them; and thus we arrive at the tyranny which Mr. Carlyle admires. But if by good luck they can light upon a plurality of Wise or Best, then they are humbly to beseech these that they would assume the sovereignty, and, uniting into a venerable senate, govern those that discern not their right hand from their left. And this is what we imagine the Greeks meant by an oligarchy. It takes for granted that men are, by essence and nature, some slaves, and others the lords of these. The difference between them, it would be contended, is such, that slaves are as living instruments, and were created for the sake of the higher beings, the aristocracy, but not for their own sake, as destined to possess, one day, beatitude and perfection in themselves.

Mark, then, courteous reader, that we have here a definition of society, not according to Catholic principles, but derived from the denial that God is known to us, or that we have relations to Him which need be considered in the political scheme. And actual specimens were suggested, a few pages back, of the social arrangements that ensue when this definition becomes the rule to interpret laws and customs. Authority governing from a centre, irresponsible, and not subject to concrete or natural limiting from the genuine estates of the nation, this we perceive

is the kind now extant in France, Prussia, Italy, and to a large extent in Austria. But it is the very same that prevails under the Tsar of all the Russias, and it is this, and nothing else, that constitutes the *ancien régime*, that system of government which was established finally by Richelieu, and was worked out into more and more detail during the hundred and thirty years that Louis XIV. and his great grandson reigned at Versailles and Trianon. It was a tyranny, sometimes resolving itself into an oligarchy, and always tempered somewhat by the privileges of the higher estates. But as regarded the bulk of the nation, were they not mere *mancipia*, except so far as the Church—and we do not mean just now the Clergy in their assemblies, but the Catholic tradition still left in France—could hinder their masters from reducing them to the very lowest grades of slavery? We contend that “the Revolution by course of law” has overthrown religious and moral principles and robbed them of their public majesty, but that it has not made the governments acknowledge that “the people” have a right to be happy and free, and that no man, however poor and ignorant, can become a means only and cease to be an end in himself. Even the French Republic, which has taken liberty and equality for its watchwords, cannot forbear from exercising more than parental dominion over the grown-up men and women of any party that it sees fit to distrust. This is the *ancien régime*. Impartial historians show us all the main qualities of it in kingly and imperial Europe of the last century, and it wants no historian to prove that the disorders in 1789 and 1793 only made it more detestable whilst adding to its power.

But men are deluded by forms, and having received the fictitious prerogative of voting, they think the central government no longer exists. Something at the centre does exist, which, as we said, lays down the plan of popular education, selects for the conscription, appoints to most offices, sets up in every commune an exponent of its own creed, and makes converts by promising and threatening. The Church has retreated into her sanctuaries, but between them the Minister of Worship and the Minister of Education provide a religion in the primary schools for such as are poor, and in the Lycées and Universities for the rich. In this point the new system outdoes the old. Kings and nobles were intent chiefly on seizing the temporal goods of their subject classes, they were comparatively indifferent to the thoughts that their serfs might entertain. But we are now enamoured of science and philosophy, we agree with Aristotle that education is the effectual method of training up a nation to its duties, provided always that we may appoint the books to be studied, and guard against insidious doctrines and dangerous teachers,

by excluding them from our seats of learning, and by requiring competitive examinations for success in every profession and walk of life. We renew our declaration that towards all creeds and theories we are strictly neutral, but we thereby render the youths in our charge neutral likewise, and the end we propose is tolerably secure. Such keen-sighted malignity was something rare in former days; it gave distinction, however, to Joseph II. and his brother of Tuscany, and was not unknown at various German universities in the time of Nicolai and his worthy confederates. Now it has been reduced to the condition of an art, and every journeyman minister has learned the trade. The *ancien régime* made slaves and paupers, the new system makes conscripts and atheists. It will not employ force openly if craft and skill suffice. Modern education proposes to assimilate all characters, to suppress individual differences, so to mould the faculties that the man may fit into his place in society as government understands the matter. For it is assumed that temporal transient society is the be-all and the end-all of every man born into this complex mechanism of cultured and industrial life. The profession, therefore, in its bearing on the State is everything, the man is nothing. Once the nobles at least had their freedom; it would be hard to say, at this moment, who is free, except the scanty number of those who guide the machine and pretend that they are following out the national behests.

Must we next undertake to prove that the Roman Church has given no aid or countenance to this legal, but not lawful, despotism? It cannot be necessary; but consider these ascertained points in the evidence we might adduce. The Church tells us that all men are made in the image of God, are brothers in Christ Jesus, and have the same end appointed them. Men are equal in nature, and in what may be called the essentials of grace, and since they thus stand on the same level, none can be the absolute end of another. Men were made for God's glory, and His glory is the beatitude possessed by each; whence it is right to say that God loves the rational creature for its own sake, and that it is, in some sense, its own end, since it was made to possess God, and, having Him within itself, need look no further. Therefore not only can a man never become the complete slave of his fellow, but whatever obedience he owes is to God alone, and to a mortal or created being only so far as he bears a commission and delegated authority from the Eternal King. Some men wield dominion over others, but *by the grace of God*, not simply by rights inherent in their nature. Thus delegated, they are indeed worthy of honour,—“the face of my Lord the King was to me as the face

of an angel of God,"—but the moment they arrogate power to themselves by not ascribing it to the Supreme Ruler, they fall into error, and, in strict logic, should be able to exercise their functions no more, or only by the consent and appointment of their some-time subjects. It is a ridiculous contradiction when some modern prince styles himself king of Italy by the grace of God and the will of the people. If God has established him on the throne, "the people" are bound to revere him as ruling in the name of God; and if He has not, and "the people" themselves acknowledge no dependence on a Creator,—and this is the supposition,—then they may perhaps appoint a minister to do their will, but cannot make him lord over themselves. Political and social authority comes, then, by gift of God, according to such forms as are natural or made known by revelation. Subjects obey God and not mere man; they have a right to seek and attain their own perfection, and can never justly be shorn of their dignity as free and responsible persons, not irrational "things," in the sight of their Maker. When they are poor, ignorant, and without means of defence, the Church is their guardian against oppression, and will do her utmost to protect their rights, conjugal, parental, proprietary. So long as her counsels and mandates are accepted by rulers, no population can fall into a state of entire servitude, or become *mancipia*, in the pagan and modern sense of that melancholy term.

Further, whilst holding that all men are free and possess certain rights which follow upon their common nature and supernatural destiny, the Church does not say that they have all equal rights, and are sovereigns entering into a compact for purposes of social advantage. Society is the work of God rather than of man; it is natural, not artificial, and it consists in a hierarchical combination of orders, one above the other, and all coalescing into an organism. This, we may assure ourselves, is the distinction that sunders for all time the theocratic from the atheistic scheme of society. Not only is it true, in principle, that whoso knows himself to be a servant of God cannot become the slave of man, but likewise that the method of preserving such rational freedom is to transcend mechanical notions, to interpret the social order on analogies of the higher type, as an organic whole devised by Infinite Wisdom, and guided to its perfection by Him. For it is not enough to say with Carlyle, after many German philosophers had thought it, and the Hegelian synthesis had given it a recognizable name, that the world is a system with one life flowing into all its veins and arteries and binding up the elements thereby, lest they fall apart in hopeless disorder. This

half-truth may, and in course of time must, have for a consequence the absorption of individuals body and soul into the devouring State. It needs yet to be completed by affirming that God is the Life of that life and deals directly with every human soul. We are safe then, and not otherwise, when we perceive that human society is for the individual, and though beautiful and god-like, is no divinity which we are bound to worship. Things are set their just limits, when above and within them all is the Infinite Spirit: should we forget Him, it will avail not much whether society appear to us a living growth or a helpless dead machine. But this first established, it follows that we know the secret of uniting liberty with law and social culture. Let it be the preamble of our enactments, that society is perfect and blessed when all the estates composing it are in such condition, and that the riches, luxury, fine manners, enlarged knowledge of the *noblesse* poorly compensate for the misery that weighs down workman and peasant. The wise politician will assert freedom for all equally, but for each in his place and degree; not that all may undertake the same offices, or cherish a reckless ambition to gain wealth, power, and station, which they cannot, by natural or inherited gifts, show their fitness for. Thus there are manifold operations, but the same spirit; there is diversity in union, and as the consequence of it living harmony, and peace that is not stagnation, but the token and result of mutual beneficence.

That political theories which do not grant these principles fall short of what is just and true, we think sufficiently clear; and that the *ancien régime* denied them in effect—whatever it pretended when put to the question. And, furthermore, that our governments from the centre, absolute chancellors, irresponsible majorities, are denying them every day. But so genuine is their agreement with the spirit of Catholicity that the one difficulty we fear is lest men should say we convert society into a religious organism, a mere Church and no State. We have, indeed, argued that the character of all human association is, from its very nature, religious, because it is moral, and morality without God is an empty chimera. We hold that the union of rational beings cannot, on any pretext, involve a denial of the living God, nor even a bland but blasphemous and absurd neutrality towards Him. But we have already guarded against the notion that State and Church have the same formal and immediate scope: we grant the Church is for the spirit of man first of all, and only in the second place for his intellectual and physical development. And we have no difficulty in admitting that the State looks immediately to the cultivation of temporal means and resources. But really and

effectively the State must also look onward to the final purpose of such civilization as may be attained, and by that purpose must regulate its own action. That, since it wields authority over life and death, and is to be obeyed for conscience sake, it derives a sacredness from God Himself, and may claim not only our homage but our reverence, is none the less true though men have judged in late years the civil order of society to be a thing utterly profane. But "profane," in the language of a Christian age, if used to distinguish State from Church, does not mean *godless*. The king, too, may wear a dalmatic and receive an unction from God's priest, for he reigns, we have said, by God's grace and direct or indirect appointment. Christian matrimony furnishes an example of the like consecration. It is something more sacred, even a Sacrament; but the relation of a ruler to his people resembles it, and not only expresses a divine mystery, but brings home to those whom it affects the sovereign dominion that God has over them. If it is merely profane, it sinks to an enforced or instinctive superiority of one man over many. Unless, then, we reckon the rational society of husband and wife to be concubinage, and that men are, in essence, of one stock with brutes, we must conclude that even the civil order is religious; but not that it seeks the supreme end in the way or by the methods that correspond to the nature of a Church.

As for the conception of a hierarchy, of course it has come to be realized in the Church mainly; and well should we think it were the State to engage in copying what it cannot excel. But unless we take up a most pernicious *Realism* in politics and subordinate individuals to an abstraction that is, in truth, founded upon them, we shall pause before denying that perfect society rises by estates, and is composed of functions that answer to individual interests, peculiarities, and privileges. Men are not to be counted by the head merely, nor does reason persuade us that all have a just claim to share the sovereign power. We must observe differences as we pretend to observe identity, and that whether we know the constitution of the Roman Church, or have fallen in with the current prejudice which mistakes the Supreme Pontiff for an autocrat, whose arbitrary will is law. Herein is the permanent value of those studies on the Revolution that Burke has bequeathed to us: they show what harm an abstract notion is capable of effecting when directly applied to the world of every day. But Plato had in this anticipated him, and many chapters of the *Republic* enforce the necessity of a "mediating" art or science—if this Teutonic expression be allowable—to secure the theorist from attempting to evolve the State out of one ambitious formula.

This is *Dialectics*,—as if one should say the art of putting reason into facts and history, of paying due regard to the individual, yet furnishing him with a pattern on which to correct what may be faulty and violent in his way of life. But the name itself almost implies that society is organic, for it tells us that the universal maxims of justice and ideal perfection must realize themselves in differences and variations; and what is this but manifesting one and the same spirit in many members? The notion, indeed, seems to be gradually supplanting an earlier one, that of visible clear equality and abolition of ranks, which has brought the French nation to a Bedford Level of mediocrity, or has gone very near to doing so. When, in 1789, the Abbé Sièyes wrote his pamphlet, "What is the Third Estate?" he answered confidently that it could be no other than the entire people, and the doctrine, being received with loud applause on all sides, was taken to explain and justify all the acts of spoliation that followed. Historians have asked whether this is not the *unpardonable sin* against social order; and with reason. For from that day France has given no signs of healthy life; and organic growth is hardly to be seen in the monotony that wastes her strength.

But our Catholic principles enable us to escape from anarchy no less than tyranny. The formal principle, the first and absolute rule, which cannot be questioned without disaster ensuing, is that society, in its very nature, is theocratic. The material principle that society must be treated as an organism and not as a machine, as living and composed of rational individuals, each one of whom is an end in himself—not as dead and directed to an extrinsic end, which it cannot properly possess but only work towards. This granted, it follows, that the sovereign authority is not First Minister elected by the people and having no more power than they of themselves can bestow, nor absolute Cæsar, throned above a multitude of purple or fustian-clad slaves. But the ruler is ordained of God, and may be called His vicar in things temporal; whence treason was fitly reckoned next to sacrilege in the Christian ages. But what external forms that sovereignty may assume is a question for the Platonic dialectics, as it depends on tradition, vested rights, grades of culture and intelligence, circumstances of the hour (as when a dictator is chosen), and on the many complicated arrangements that fall out one cannot tell how, nor are subject to any major premisses of science. To battle for monarchy against republic, or for either against aristocracy, is not laid upon us by our principles; and to imagine that any one of these is alone suitable to nations and cities, argues a man ignorant of men, and needing to voyage with the subtle and observant Odysseus. When society is framed on the Catholic

model, such influence as its peculiar form may exercise will find a check in the influence of those first principles which we have named and contrasted. These will resemble the spirit that governs, and the form will be as an instrument by which it manifests energy and applies it. A form ill-adapted to the historical character of the nation is likely to cause harm, and keep back development; but sometimes, if it has gained the approval of the chief estates (or even of an incompetent majority), the mischief may be smaller in bearing with its imperfections than in making a large innovation and risking the public peace. These simple remarks will help us to understand that indifference to the form of governments which Catholics feel, and how they can be satisfied with every institution, so long as it does not deny the theocratic and hierarchical principles. Some have thought they perceived a kind of political "eclecticism" in all this, and that the Roman Church had learned wisdom by experience; but they have seen beside the mark. Such impartial agreement with monarchies and republics springs from the faithful interpreting of the Faith; nor would we lightly concede that the Church has acquired, and not rather inherited, her prudence and freedom from political narrowness. But of this later.

For it is time to deal with an objection, or perhaps a whole series of objections, that Italian and French statesmen of the modern school have made familiar to us all. Are we not advocating a paradox, even a shameless one, in this philosophic discourse on what the Church thinks, and is aiming to realize? Everywhere, it will be said, Catholics have entered into alliance with rigid Conservatives, with Loyalists and Legitimists, with the party opposed to reform, progress, and civil liberty. And are they not bent on restoring old abuses under the name of privilege? Are not they, in fact, the chief enemies of free government and popular rights, devoted to a scheme which would bring back, with whatever declarations to the contrary, that *ancien régime* in which king and clergy stood together and shared the dominion over mankind? This is the sum of many eloquent books recently put forth, and may be considered the staple and *locus communis* of leading articles written in this country on Catholic matters. It is a formidable charge, because of its vague and shifting outlines; because it appeals to history and to present facts, and very often claims the merit of giving us plain good sense in answer to the subtleties of Ultramontane politicians; and of course it opens many a question that we cannot discuss in our narrow limits.

Some portions of this representation we have already dealt with in remarking on the principles of organic unity. It looks

certain enough, that a loyal Catholic nation, seeking to realize the true theory in its social order, would in course of time exchange the modern for a medieval republic or monarchy. And in the wake of so great a change would follow laws and statutes to encourage the Catholic ideal of life in all classes; but not precipitately, nor to the violating of legitimate prescription. Before many years were over and gone, we might count ourselves to be in a fresh cycle of the world's history, and hope for the human race would no longer seem the delusion that it is to-day. The spirit of the age might then call himself "almost a Christian," instead of being, as now, wholly an infidel. But why imagine that to recognize unquestionable truths, the foundation to any political order which can endure, is a relapse into abuses and tyrannies that the Church never approved, but in the worst of seasons only tolerated? Is it Catholic doctrine, that the government, at its perfect height, is "despotism tempered by epigrams," or by the bowstring? Richelieu, Mazarin, Louvois, Choiseul, Kaunitz, Pombal, are these the names of statesmen after the Church's own heart, and not rather of enemies to civil and religious culture, ministers that did much of their own accord to abolish all that the Middle Age had left? When we speak of a Catholic restoration (to say nothing as yet upon the lawful means of bringing it about), our thoughts go back, not to the seventeenth, but to the thirteenth century, to the heroes whom Catholic devotion has canonized, not to monarchs eaten up with pleasure and luxury. But perhaps, from what has been said, this is clear; it may serve a purpose if we endeavour to explain, not that there is no essential connection between Catholicity and the *ancien régime*, but what those affinities are upon which the charge has been founded.

Aristotle says the true mean, in every science and art, will appear to have in it something of both extremes: hence to the superficial its attributes may seem inconsistent and their union impossible. Philip II. perhaps suspected Suarez of thinking a republic the only legitimate form of government. In ancient contests the Church sided with *bourgeoisie* and aristocracy against the German Cæsar and his imperial and arbitrary law. And like instances occur in the century we are now closing. But, on the other hand, fosterers of revolution declare that the clerical order is blindly devoted to kings, and would thus associate in a common ruin the throne and the altar. For it is our misfortune that the political problem, so difficult in itself, has been set out for solution after an illogical fashion. And whereas the question was theocracy or no theocracy, it has been converted into another, infinitely less momentous and hardly within the bounds of science at all—into the question of Republic

or Monarchy. Catholics insist that first principles deserve consideration before special forms; but instead of bringing their enemies to reason, they "make them mad," and receive for a reward contumely from all sides.

But as matters stand in Europe, there is less affinity between the Church and the Republican spirit than between Catholics and Conservatives. This is, in part, due to the Republicans themselves, who are not so anxious to pull down the king as to make the nations Atheistic and Secular. In part, also, to the wide-spread misapprehension that a thorough Catholic is bent on restoring Don Carlos and Henri de Bourbon. And in part, finally, to those ardent Legitimists who preach a crusade on behalf of Church and King together, and who would hesitate to condemn outright the Anglican theory—for it is not Catholic—of passive obedience, or of only passive resistance, in any emergency.

To enter upon some details. Conservatism, the new name for an emphatic exhibition of an old principle, we understand to mean "*Quieta non movere*." It is a much more abstract and generic maxim than those from which we derive Legitimism, Republicanism, or Monarchism. It could not, therefore, surprise thoughtful students, when the peasant-proprietors in France, and the country-class throughout America, showed themselves determined Conservatives, although hostile to Monarchy; for the two things have little connection in nature, or, at least, it does not appear until one has examined somewhat deeply. Now it may, under circumstances, be as prudent to make great changes—involving various interests in discomfort and perplexity—as not to make them, under others; and never to carry out new measures would mean that we had renounced the hope of improving human affairs or wished not to risk sacrifices even though duty required them. In this absolute sense few philosophers have been conservative, and Edmund Burke as little as any. Nor can we wonder. Reason is a perpetual critic of all institutions except those that are simply divine; and criticism is not evil in itself, but only when it becomes licentious or frivolous. Since reason in politics needs to be regulated, but not to be suppressed, an unintelligent Conservatism, samples of which are never wanting, can claim the homage of no Catholic. Religion has not even a tendency to set her seal upon all accomplished facts; and Conservatism of this sort is really the doctrine that facts (only they must have attained a certain age) are consecrated and unassailable. Nor is Christian patience quite the same thing as glorifying the corruptions and abuses that have lasted down to our own age. Virtues that conquered the Roman empire and transformed barbarous races

into noble and polished citizens of the medieval confederation, never can have been forms of gross contentment with an imperfect world. It seems almost a platitude to say that motion and rest are alike consistent with nature and required by it. But Catholics are thought to have never learned this clear principle, and we see that "religion" and "progress" appear as irreconcilable to the common mind. Yet some sort of advance upon the past is involved in the very notion of history, and Catholics do but ask, whence and whither? "To change often," a great authority has said, "is to be perfect"; and the dictum has a fund of wisdom in it, so long as the change is not from one unreasonable assumption to another, but along a line of intuitions which grow more and more germane to the matter of daily life, or of inferences that have been wisely tested. So that the problem how to advance is never answered by not advancing at all, and by proscribing reason, but by considering what principles the wise intellect can here admit to be true, and with a certain deliberateness applying them. In such manner Christian prudence fears neither to fall behind the age, if we only comprehend what this means, nor to violently correct what it would be safer to let alone.

For it can never be sufficiently borne in mind, that whilst the Church holds up to men a heavenly ideal of conduct, and unfolds before them a prospect of divine truth which reaches to almost infinite distances, how far that ideal shall be realized in life, with what clearness that prospect shall be viewed, depends in quite an incalculable measure on their voluntary choice. The Church is never in a state of uniform growth or decline, and the maxim is ever true, that "To him who hath more shall be given, whilst from him that hath not, even what he seemeth to have shall be taken away." A living organism is not a something unyielding and inflexible. The Church is not on her trial; she cannot fail; but each and every individual is and can. So, too, is it with the nations of the earth, after they have accepted the yoke of Christ and been baptized; they still show countless varieties of development and education: some are more Catholic than others, some give glory to God, by an heroic practice of one or the other virtue; all have their prevailing faults, and are liable to commit national sins in consequence of them. It is the same with different epochs and eras, for the Church has not received a commission to conquer once for all, or to reach the meridian splendour in any one age; she must abide "*donec occurramus omnes in virum perfectum*," according to the words of S. Paul. And again, her predestined history is told us in the parable of the mustard-seed. As, then, a confessor is expected, not to make a man perfect all at once,

but to administer the sacrament of healing, and to guide, instruct, warn, or be silent, as may best conduce to the salvation of the soul which is confided to him, so must the Church behave with a kind of providence, "reaching from end to end, disposing all things strongly and sweetly," and bearing with many imperfections, because there seems no hope as yet of amending them, and to insist peremptorily on a change of conduct might be fatal to the very interests which she desires to promote. And this is finely and strikingly brought out in the relations of the Holy See to the various civil governments which formerly or at present have been called Catholic. For nothing is harder to convert than a government, and the Church was meant to begin by winning the individual, and only after many years and much painful struggling can she subdue the State to the obedience of Christ. So, likewise, the State is perpetually in revolt, complete or partial, against this supernatural authority; and unless it be treated with great wisdom, sooner or later its inborn pride will overcome its faith. Nothing has been rarer amongst the phenomena of history than a persevering State policy which was truly Christian. The annals of mediæval countries will prove what we say to any one who cares to look over them. But wherever, and in what degree, the supreme authorities have taken on them the yoke of the Gospel and laboured in the light of orthodox principles, there has grown up a bold, persevering, manly character in the people, and the epoch has deserved to be called, not critical and weak like our own, but creative. Mere Conservatism is a dead weight upon a nation: but surely it is good historical fact that the Catholic Church found a chaos in Europe, and has left it more cultured and human than were ever Greece, or Asia, or Imperial Rome.

But enough of an old argument. Let us indicate one final question, which may have its importance any day that a European war begins. Conservatism, pure and absolute, is little to the taste of a Catholic, and seems, in fact, to be selfishness laid down as a political axiom. But ere Conservatives were known, we admired in England our loyal *Tories*, who revered Church and King, and would have given their lives for either. Is not the Tory a Catholic at heart, with his devotion to living persons, his unflinching courage on their behalf, and his forgetfulness of self under an ancient flag, or to shield the Lord's anointed? And, if so, Legitimism must be Catholic too, for what is the Legitimist and the Jacobite but a Tory in exile? Can we set him down as atheistic or an enemy to mankind when he has obeyed a generous impulse, and fights to redress the injury inflicted on his sovereign?

No, indeed, we should grieve to think of so chivalrous a nature otherwise than tenderly. From us he shall have due honour. Loyalty to a living man whom one has never seen, from whom one hopes for no advancement, is love carried to the ideal, something beautiful and brave, touching the heart as the strings of a sweet instrument may touch the hearing and stir us to heroic resolves. Between the grasping conservative spirit of a rustic, who thinks but of his oxen and his corn, and the spirit of a "king's follower," whether the king be Charles I. or Henri V., there is a difference like that between lust and love. But the passionate attachment that would do and dare all for an earthly sovereign may lead, as will even the most generous love, to disaster and ruin. When a Liberal bursts into glowing eulogy of reason, and claims for it authority to pass judgment on civil and religious institutions, he is answered by more fervent oratory from such as have ventured, or lost, all for love, and think the sacrifice was a light one if it witnessed to the grandeur of their passion. But what can the philosopher say as he looks on and sees nature warring with itself, love and reason contending for the mastery? Will it avail for him to declare that love should be reasonable and reason loving, and that, since these powers are in man, the harmony between them can yet be discovered if sought after? We know not. Certain it is that, as Aristotle teaches, that community is best governed in which law, that is to say reason, reigns supreme, for a human king cannot serve as the perfect ideal, and the law must be his stay, as it is that of the citizen. Were he to put himself above all law and custom, he would almost be arrogating to himself divinity. But yet again, law that is embodied in no human form wears too awful and too forbidding a countenance, nor can it be perfect, as being stern, and inflexible, and without intelligence for the weakness and the changing wants of this lower life. May we not say, that, in the general course, it behoves us to cherish loyalty not to the State alone but to the King as its crown and summing up? But that when anarchy threatens because the King has forgotten his wisdom and clearly gone beyond his power, we must, even out of love for the people, determine to obey reason and principle, to act with all gentleness and caution (so far as, in a crisis, that can be) and only when no remedy appears for a desperate wound, to give our conscientious vote against the unworthy ruler? This we know, at any rate, that there is a King of every state in whom we may find our ideal, for Christ the King is perfect reason and at the same time perfect man; and our loyal devotion to Him should teach the measure we must use in loving an earthly monarch. Here,

too, the absolute principle is that we acknowledge and give ourselves to serve the living God ; nor can Legitimism discard or overlook it without sinking into base adulation and inhuman betrayal of one's country. The time may therefore come when we must choose between a nation and a dynasty, when, at least, those who renounce the King may plead in excuse that further allegiance to him would imperil the country without adequate cause. A War of the Roses is often as unprincipled as it is fierce and bloody ; and who can think such wars compatible with the nature or scope of society ? We are bound to keep in view all the principles, generic and specific, that rule political science, and when the lower conflicts with the higher, it is clear which must be taken as the rule. For it is not the principles themselves that make war upon each other, but our concrete application of them, or as Plato would say, our failure in the study of Dialectics. Looking at humankind as associated for a common purpose and intended to work it out by mutual harmony, we can scarcely deny that sometimes a Merovingian succession must yield to the true king who has disguised himself as a *maire du palais*, and this not because he has a direct right to seize the crown, but lest that should happen which never was designed by the Author of society, and is contrary to its essential notion ; viz., lest anarchy take the place of a living order, and the foundations of justice and liberty be rooted up, But upon the law of such a change we have, at present, no space to enlarge.

The truth is, kings enough have been set down from their thrones, or, as Carlyle says bitterly, have sent in their resignation. The unrelenting war of democracy against them has gone far, and if dangers threaten our social progress and established order, it is not because kings retain their crowns and mantles, or still require our homage. The standing menace to Europe is that spirit of atheistic centralization which governs France, Germany, Italy, and Austria, to disregard for the moment that enormous Slavic power which has yet its part to play on the theatre of cultured life. Whether we consider what was, in truth, the genius of that age which ended in 1789 in universal catastrophe, or of the aggressive Revolution which for more than twenty years held the world in trembling and amaze ; or the provisional governments fabricated by the Congress of Vienna ; or the rampant military powers which, since the war of the Crimea, have contested the dominion of those seven nations that, in the eyes of Victor Hugo, are the rainbow of humanity, in each and every instance we may assure ourselves the guiding spirit is the same. But here comes

in a remarkable distinction between classical times and our own.

If a Greek philosopher, like those we have so often quoted, could "revisit the glimpses of the moon," and see what parties are contending for victory in Europe, he would, we think, be overcome with horror at one peculiar circumstance. He would declare that *the slaves had risen and meant to attain the supremacy*. In his own age and country the conflict may have seemed ever so violent, but it was between what we call the higher classes. Now it rages between rich and poor, that is, in Greek phrase, between the slaves and their masters; and no pages of the classic history are so full of dreadful cruelty as those that record a *servile* war. When the slaves revolted, the laws ceased to bind, and only by sheer killing could the danger be arrested. Two or three servile wars on a large scale would have ended not only the Hellenic but the earlier Roman polity; the conviction may be felt even as we study grave writers like Polybius and Livy. But is not this very calamity now hanging over us? Labour and capital, as they are styled in modern jargon, are arrayed against each other, and who can reconcile them? The people, it is rightly said, are not wise enough to govern the Republic; but to govern it they are resolved. Misery and vice and despair widely prevail amongst them, and so it was when slaves were numerous in the Roman Empire. And they have been taught that God does not care for them, that prayer is a mockery, future life a delusion, restraint of the passions a want of manliness, submission to rulers the token of an uncivilized and childish epoch. We trust we are not exaggerating in this mournful description of how the poor have been trained up by their refined teachers; but the difficulty of realizing all that it means is great. Must we conclude that "servile" outbreaks against order are likely to occur at brief intervals, and that in some fury of successful revolt the present generation will find an end, will commit suicide—as Hartmann would devoutly wish? Or will that be carried out to the full which is already in course, and "men of blood and iron" transform the lower classes into an army, and so keep the ignominy—for such it would be—of an enforced European peace? We hardly dare surmise; and yet granting that the battle is waged between godless Knowledge and godless Ignorance, we think that Ignorance might win. George Eliot has said with undeniable truth: "*It is a common sentence that knowledge is power; but who hath duly considered or set forth the power of Ignorance? Knowledge slowly builds up what Ignorance in an hour pulls down. Knowledge, instructing*

the sense, refining and multiplying needs, transforms itself into Skill, and makes life various with a new six days' work; comes Ignorance drunk on the seventh, with a firkin of oil and a match and an easy 'Let there not be,' and the many-coloured creation is shrivelled up in blackness." Such things have been: is there any security, given by gods or demons, that they shall never be again? If Providence does not exist to govern the world, it cannot be invoked to save the world from ruin; and should there be a Providence after all, can we hope it will preserve, or even long endure, the rulers and people that have blasphemed the divine majesty and worshipped their own excellence?

Unless our argument has been wholly in vain, we have proved that one way of escape remains open. Society must believe in God as formerly it did, or with even more earnestness, for it is called on to make reparation and to do penance. But, as in the designs of God, so it has been, so it is in history, that a civilized people can retain their faith in the Living Maker of the world only when it is strengthened and guarded by the Christian religion, which, in preaching Christ, brings down, as it were, the Divinity from heaven, home to the heart and the spirit of learned and ignorant alike. And again we ask whether vital Christianity is permanent and secure in societies that have broken away from the Roman Church? The contrary is so true that many infidels have observed it, and that thoughtful Protestants are looking on in dismay at the conversion, now so common, of orthodox Christianity into Pietism, then into Unitarianism, then into Agnosticism. What can be the result in a few years of spreading this respectable and insidious atheism amongst the stolid middle-classes which were wont to be merely men of the world, or to think that they held the Christian creed? We see but one answer. And thus the Catholic Church stands over against modern Europe in its two camps, the one of the Servile revolt, the other of the crowned Revolution. She has but one method of dealing with them,—to display her credentials from on high, and, if they will listen, to explain her doctrine and offer them heavenly gifts in the seven Sacraments. But they need not listen, or listening, may refuse to be converted. And what can she do, then, except put their danger before her children, and stir them up to prayer that the divine pity may work a miracle of grace and love? She bears no sword to coerce heathen like these, and her mission is to show the nations that God has willed to save them if they also are willing.

And sometime they may be; but what if the conversion should come too late? God has forgiven men their sins,

yet left them to undergo the consequences in this world. Perhaps, by some law of retribution, Europe, with its glory and its hope, may pass into the silence that now reigns over Egypt and Babylon. We have trusted in reason rather than in religion; have extolled our freedom, but never thanked God for it; have chosen mechanical logic, instead of prayer, as the guide of life; have bartered spiritual and rational love for insane passion and a frivolous culture: we have trodden down the poor, taken from them their liberties, and given them instead license, atheism, and sensual desires: we have made man the crown of things, and God an idle dream. Catholicity has seemed to us a despotism; pure Christianity we think never existed, and would have ended in fanaticism if it had. We believe that truth is unattainable, and we almost hope that death may end our being. The highest grace of conversation is to be cynical and indifferent, and the wisdom of life is to trust no human creature. Pleasure is good, and is very likely the only good; no cause is worth our undergoing pain to further or defend it. Thus do we become unheroic, ignoble, indolent; and our enforced leisure from grave and grand pursuits we amuse by studying trifles or by lounging at a banquet of music. For in this we take delight as furnishing us a shadowy reminiscence of what we concede to be beautiful, but can no longer put faith in. Our poetry, when it means to be in earnest, is sad and sceptical, inquisitive into the moods and passions of the soul, but a song without hope. We have grown up to Hamlet's idle manhood, with its hesitating action and its scruple-stricken motives: "the native hue of resolution is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought." And when, after a few years, the barbarians break up out of the ground and assault our palaces, will they find any but a race of cowards and effeminates to keep back their advance?

NOTE TO THE ARTICLES ON F. CURCI.

SINCE F. Curci has made what the world announces to be a "retraction," it is natural to inquire into the meaning and effective worth of such an act. For, sometimes, to withdraw an opinion is compatible with holding it in silence, and merely binds a man to refrain from expressing himself to others. And again, he may regret and condemn the manner, and yet be a thousand miles from disapproving of the matter of what he has put forward. Writings, likewise, which embarrass, or even vilify the policy carried out by ecclesiastical superiors, and by the Holy See itself, do not of necessity offend against Catholic doctrine. And as the charge of so doing is an exceedingly grave one, we should be slow to fasten it upon those who sincerely declare that they wish nothing else than to believe whatever the Church lays down, and that they are not conscious of thinking otherwise than as they have been taught. Now it seems to us impossible for any one, after he has read F. Curci, to doubt his honest intention of submitting himself to the divine Teacher, as in general, so in what regards the Civil Princedom of the Popes. Not only has he never dreamt of consciously setting up theories that authority would have, sooner or later, to repudiate, but it was his firm persuasion, when writing the *Moderno Dissidio*, that he knew all the points of Catholic doctrine which concerned him, and that he was faithfully quoting them and putting their truth beyond the reach of cavil. If he is still of this mind, it cannot occur to him that, in laying a retraction at the feet of Leo XIII., he has had any doctrine to change. Scandal, perhaps, he knew that he had given; and, on reflection, the tone, manner, sentiment of his late remonstrances must have appeared in their true light, as every way condemnable, and, we will add, as even disloyal. But schism is not heresy, and the most ungenerous disrespect and stubbornness towards Pius IX. need not have included a misapprehension of the Pontiff's teaching.

We have no means of discovering what the value may be which F. Curci attributes to his submission. When he refused, earlier, to make it in general terms, the reason assigned by him was, that he did not choose to have people deceived on his account; that a vague declaration would imply, under the circumstances, his belief in a "thirteenth article of the Creed," by which he meant the so-styled dogma that the Roman Princedom would soon be restored to the condition in which it existed before 1870. For this assurance he could perceive the grounds neither in Scripture nor in tradition; he thought it an idle fancy, invented as some justification for a line

of conduct ending, or likely to end, in disaster to Church and State. He, for one, would strive all in his power to demonstrate how pernicious and unreasonable it was, would assuredly "be brayed in a mortar," sooner than pretend to believe it. But what was to be held on the *Temporal Power* as contained in the Bishops' address of 1862, and in the *Syllabus*, he never had called in question, but had laid to heart and defended with all his might. He took the sum of it to be that the Roman Pontiff is, by virtue of his dignity, exempt from secular jurisdiction; that for the altogether independent action of the Church he must be truly a Sovereign; and that, *if* the Church is to possess the *fullest* liberty, Providence will so dispose the course of things as to bestow a civil principality upon him. We are bound to take notice that the last statement is hardly, if at all, visible in the original letter that gave rise to these disputings.

What more, we ask ourselves, could any one desire than a profession so large as this? And how comes it that Catholics have been unwilling to acquiesce in it as final and satisfactory? F. Curci cannot help us here, but his book may. We learn from it that whilst he conceded *hypothetical* rights to the Pope, he thought the hypothesis to be almost chimerical. *If* Providence willed the Church to enjoy her fullest liberty—good; but, on the other hand, he argued, is not the Church militant, and are not her children promised the grace of persecution and trouble, not peace, or sovereignty? In a given case, such things will follow; but the case remains hypothetical, and therefore they do not follow. In a word, we interpret very many passages and the whole tenor of his argument to signify that the Pope may have conditional claims to a certain dignity, but has now no real title, because he cannot enforce it. F. Coleridge, in his remarks on F. Curci, makes him "say in effect" that "perhaps the providence of God may have some other means in store, by which the Church may have liberty sufficient for her divine work of the salvation of souls, without the particular feature of the Temporal Independence of her head." And, in fact, F. Curci asserts that another *régime* may serve better to advance the end that religion has in view, and that the Civil Princedom is not, in modern Europe, a very efficient bulwark of the Holy See. To practically surrender it, in his opinion, would not only be a clear gain, but is the one course by which to escape disaster and ruin. Some *Via media*, by which the Pope should exchange the prospect of some day getting back his real sovereignty, for a moral but genuine independence protected by the Italian people and parliament, is, he insists upon it, discoverable. We agree with the author of the *Breve Esame*, and with F. Coleridge, that this is "to evade in every way that is in his power, the argumentative and practical force" of that declaration of 1862, which

he desires to accept with reverence ; and that by ingenious fancies of a like colour any doctrinal definition of the Church, and even the articles of the Creed, might be shown to contain no meaning whatsoever. How can a Catholic keep himself free from error when he does not in so many words deny, but evade the signification of certain doctrines ? We think it has happened before now that a subtle disputant has affirmed every statement proposed to him by Pope and Council, and has then proceeded to hang a commentary thereupon, in which the Catholic truth was reconciled with its real contradictory. Look at these sentences side by side : first, the Civil Princedom of the Popes is necessary for the proper independence of the Church. But next, this does not prevent their moral, not real sovereignty, from conducting more effectively to the end for which the Church has been made independent—the salvation of souls. By what *tour de force* can the same intellect receive these propositions together ?

But F. Curci has not stated the Catholic doctrine rightly. Pius IX. and the Bishops were engaged on something more important than drawing out the consequences of an *If*. They said, *since* the Church has a right to her independence, and *since* the Roman Pontiff is her chief ruler, and her prerogatives are bound up with his, therefore he has a right to be a sovereign Prince possessed of territory and master in his own city. If men will not allow him to acquire such possession, that leaves his title intact ; and if, when he has acquired it, they despoil him or bring in a state of things which involves his deposition, they are guilty of sacrilegious injustice, but he remains legitimate sovereign, and cannot promise that he will never, in a favourable conjuncture, attempt the recovery of his own.

F. Curci looks for a *Via media* where, in sober truth, none can exist, and, in consequence, he affirms and denies in confusing alternation ; on one page is loyal and orthodox, on another is inspired by the genius of nationalism and copies the rhetoric of Italian Liberals. But if he is inconsistent, it follows that he certainly is in the wrong. Pius IX., to tersely resume the Catholic doctrine, tells us that “in Rome the Pope must be a sovereign or a captive.” F. Curci replies that a condition removed from both extremes is conceivable. The Syllabus condemns as many as would assert that to abrogate the Civil Princedom is greatly conducive to the Church’s prosperity. F. Curci undertakes to show that the Church would be saved an immense disaster were the Princedom practically surrendered, and that a new *modus vivendi* would better suit the altered circumstances of the age ; that is to say, would enable the Church to flourish as now she cannot. The Bishops in 1862 aver that the Sovereignty of Rome is required for the freedom and security of the Catholic religion at this present time. F. Curci

represents them as saying that it *would* be necessary, were the Church intended to be perfectly free; and he adds, that such is not the divine intention. Pius IX., writing to the English Episcopate, declares that considerations of principle (drawn from the very constitution of the Church) *utterly exclude* all reconciliation with United Italy. F. Curci assures us that principles do not stand in the way of a satisfactory arrangement. Leo XIII. renews the protest and repeats the doctrine of his predecessor, that "the Temporal Power is necessary to us, in order to defend and protect the full freedom of the Spiritual Power"; that, "in the Sovereign Temporality of the Holy See are involved the public well-being and the safety of human society"; that "the Church, as a perfect society, possesses every right to that full independence which is denied her." And F. Curci had already shown him "a better way" to protect his spiritual authority, and affirmed that the Roman Princedom was of slight importance from that point of view, whilst the claims to have it restored had become, since 1870, merely hypothetical, their worth being measured by what the Government was likely to concede. And whereas at the Vatican Council, Pius IX. had instructed Catholics of their obligation to hold all that he had been teaching in authoritative documents, F. Curci would have them think that it is enough if they believe explicitly "the twelve articles of the Creed," and merely in general whatever else the Holy See proposes. Lay Christians, it would seem, may fall into as many errors as they choose, and never take the trouble to correct them by studying what the Church had said upon those very matters.

We are far from having exhausted the list of novel assertions—to say not a word of inferences and implications—which any one may read for himself in the *Moderno Dissidio*. They amount, we cannot but believe, to a real and substantial difference between the opinions of F. Curci and the doctrinal teachings of the Church. For the Roman Princedom he would substitute a moral sovereignty; for a real, an hypothetical necessity; for means declared to be requisite, and the only sufficient, other means condemned as insufficient; principles bearing on practice he takes to be speculative only, and a reconciliation solemnly refused in the light of those principles he recommends as not incompatible with them, because they are speculative. He commits himself to an evasive method that would, in the judgment of grave persons, rob the very articles of the Creed of their true signification; and, to crown all, he would justify those Catholics who remain ignorant of doctrinal decisions which affect their daily thoughts and their public action. Is it possible, after this, that his Letter and his book have not offended the purity of the Catholic faith? Can he have said nothing that is temerarious, ill-sounding to pious ears, theologically false and erroneous,

or connected, more or less closely, with systems already proscribed? According to the venerable man who governs the Society of Jesus, F. Curci had manifested notions and *principles* that were not in conformity with the unanimous and universal sentiments of the Episcopate, and he was required to *reprobate and condemn* the writing of 1875, retracting everything in that, and in the books he had printed, and the discourses public and private that he had held, which had been noted as contrary to the prescriptions and dispositions of the Holy See and the Pope, to the propositions of the Syllabus and the other acts put forth by the supreme ecclesiastical authority. Could such a demand have been made, if no doctrines had been in question? F. Curci himself says very distinctly that this was the precise injustice of it, for that he had in nothing contravened Catholic teaching. But if the *Moderno Dissidio* represents what he had said, we cannot agree with him; neither, we think, will the cautious reader who compares that volume with the Papal documents.

We had drawn out a number of references to F. Curci by way of proving that we attribute nothing to him but what he has said. However, the space cannot be afforded for these quotations, and to such as have studied him they are not necessary. If, indeed, he has now sincerely accepted the whole teaching of Pius IX. and Leo XIII. we are confident he will perceive that his writings on this subject cannot stand, because in spirit and principle they contradict what every loyal Catholic knows he must believe. As a compensation for the scandal and confusion that F. Curci, against his own wishes, has brought about, we may assure ourselves that it is now published everywhere that the Church has a doctrine on the Roman Princedom, which must regulate her policy towards any Italian government, present or future. This, at all events, has been made clear.

We cannot break off without saying what a pleasure it has given us to read the impartial and very temperate description of "the case of F. Curci" which appeared in the "Month" for May. It will assuredly not be thought severe by those who know in what manner F. Curci has written; and upon some points it is remarkably lenient. The English public have now the facts before them in simple and unimpassioned language: it will be their own fault if they dishonour F. Curci with denials which he has not made, or if they cannot perceive that he has acted with persistent disloyalty towards the interests of the Church. Whether his late retraction, whatever its meaning as he wrote it, should in all fairness have included the unsaying of what the Church has condemned, whether it must, to be satisfactory, have had a reference to doctrinal mistakes committed by the author of the *Moderno Dissidio*, may, perhaps, seem plain enough from the foregoing.

SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI LEONIS
DIVINA PROVIDENTIA PAPÆ XIII.
EPISTOLA ENCYCLICA.

*Venerabilibus Fratribus, Patriarchis, Primatibus, Archiepiscopis et
Episcopis Universis Catholici Orbis, gratiam et communionem
cum Apostolica Sede habentibus.*

LEO PP. XIII.

VENERABILES FRATRES SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM.

INSCRUTABILI Dei consilio ad Apostolicæ Dignitatis fastigium licet immerentes eveci, vehementi statim desiderio ac veluti necessitate urgeri Nos sensimus, Vos litteris alloquendi, non modo ut sensus intimæ dilectionis Nostre Vobis expromeremus, sed etiam ut Vos in partem sollicitudinis Nostre vocatos, ad sustinendam Nobiscum horum temporum dimicationem pro Ecclesia Dei et pro salute animarum, ex munere Nobis divinitus credito confirmaremus.

Ab ipsis enim Nostri Pontificatus exordiis tristis Nobis sese offert spectus malorum quibus hominum genus undique premitur: hæc tam late patens subversio supremarum veritatum quibus, tamquam fundamentis, humanæ societatis status continetur; hæc ingeniorum protervia legitimæ cujusque potestatis impatiens; hæc perpetua dissidiorum causa, unde intestinæ concertationes, sæva et cruenta bella existunt; contemptus legum quæ mores regunt justitiamque tuentur; fluxarum rerum inexplebilis cupiditas et æternarum oblivio usque ad vesanum illum furorem, quo tot miseri passim violentas sibi manus inferre non timent; inconsulta bonorum publicorum administratio, effusio, interversio; nec non eorum impudentia qui, cum maxime fallunt, id agunt, ut patriæ ut libertatis et cujuslibet juris propugnatores esse videantur; ea denique quæ serpit per artus intimos humanæ societatis lethifera quædam pestis, quæ eam quiescere non sinit, ipsique novas rerum conversiones et calamitosos exitus portendit.

Horum autem malorum causam in eo præcipue sitam esse Nobis persuasum est, quod despecta ac rejecta sit sancta illa et augustissima Ecclesiæ Auctoritas, quæ Dei nomine humano generi præest, et legitimæ cujusque auctoritatis vindex est et præsidium. Quod cum hostes publici ordinis probe noverint, nihil aptius ad societatis fundamenta convellenda putaverunt, quam si Ecclesiam Dei pertinaci aggressionem peterent, et probrosæ calumniis in invidiam odiumque vocantes quasi ipsa civili veri nominis humanitati adversaretur, ejus auctoritatem et vim novis in dies vulneribus labefactarent, supremamque potestatem Romani Pontificis everterent, in quo æternæ ac immutabiles boni rectique rationes custodem in terris habent et adsertorem. Hinc porro profectæ sunt leges divinam Catholicæ Ecclesiæ constitutionem convellentes, quas in plerisque regionibus

atas esse deploramus; hinc dimanarunt Episcopalis potestatis contemptus, objecta ecclesiastici Ministerii exercitio impedimenta, religiosorum cœtuum disjectio, ac publicatio bonorum, quibus Ecclesiæ administri et pauperes alebantur; hinc effectum ut a salutari Ecclesiæ moderamine publica instituta, caritati et beneficentiæ consecrata, subducerentur; hinc orta effrenis illa libertas prava quæque docendi et in vulgus edendi, dum ex adverso modis omnibus Ecclesiæ jus ad juventutis institutionem et educationem violatur et opprimitur. Neque alio spectat civilis Principatus occupatio, quem divina Providentia multis abhinc sæculis Romano Antistiti concessit, ut libere ac expedite potestate a Christo collata ad æternam populorum salutem uteretur.

Funestam hanc ærumnarum molem Vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, commemoravimus, non ad augendam tristitiam Vestram, quam miserrima hæc rerum conditio per se Vobis ingerit; sed quia intelligimus ex ea Vobis apprimè perspectum fore, quanta sit gravitas rerum quæ ministerium et zelum nostrum exposcunt, et quam magno studio nobis ad laborandum sit, ut Ecclesiam Christi et hujus Apostolicæ Sedis dignitatem, tot calumniis lacescitanti, in hac præsertim iniquitate temporum pro viribus defendamus et vindicemus.

Clare innotescit ac liquet, Venerabiles Fratres, civilis humanitatis rationem solidis fundamentis destitui, nisi æternis principiis veritatis et immutabilibus recti justique legibus innitatur, ac nisi hominum voluntates inter se sincera dilectio devinciatur, officiorumque inter eos vices ac rationes suaviter moderetur. Jamvero equis negare audeat Ecclesiam esse, quæ diffuso per gentes Evangelii præconio, lucem veritatis inter effratos populos et fœdis superstitionibus imbutos adduxit, eosque ad divinum rerum auctorem agnoscendum et sese respiciendos excitavit; quæ servitutis calamitate sublata, ad pristinam naturæ nobilissimæ dignitatem homines revocavit; quæ in omnibus terræ plagis redemptionis signo explicato, scientiis et artibus adductis aut suo tectis præsidio, optimis caritatis institutis, quæis omnis generis ærumnis consultum est fundatis et in tutelam receptis, ubique hominum genus privatim et publice excoluit, a squalore vindicavit et ad vitæ formam, humanæ dignitati ac spei consentaneam, omni studio composuit? Quod si quis sanæ mentis hanc ipsam qua vivimus ætatem, Religioni et Ecclesiæ Christi infensissimam, cum iis temporibus auspicatissimis conferat, quibus Ecclesia uti mater a gentibus colebatur, omnino comperiet ætatem hanc nostram perturbationibus et demolitionibus plenam, recta ac rapide in suam perniciem ruere; ea vero tempora optimis institutis, vitæ tranquillitate, opibus et prosperitate eo magis floruisse, quo Ecclesiæ regiminis ac legum sese observantiores populi exhibuerunt. Quod si plurima ea quæ memoravimus bona, ab Ecclesiæ ministerio et salutari ope profecta, vera sunt humanitatis civilis opera ac decora, tantum abest ut Ecclesia Christi ab ea abhorreat eamve respuat, ut ad sese potius altricis magistræ et matris ejus laudem omnino censeat pertinere.

Quin immo illud civilis humanitatis genus, quod sanctis Ecclesiæ doctrinis et legibus ex adverso repugnet, non aliud nisi civilis cultus figmentum et abs re nomen inane putandum est. Cujus rei manifesto sunt

argumento populi illi, quæ evangelica lux non affulsit, quorum in vita fucus quidem humanioris cultus conspici potuit, at solida et vera ejus bona non vigerunt. Haudquaquam sane civilis vitæ perfectio ea ducenda est, qua legitima quæque potestas audacter confemnitur; neque ea libertas reputanda, quæ effreni errorum propagatione, pravis cupiditatibus libere explendis, impunitate flagitiorum et scelerum, oppressione optimorum civium cujusque ordinis, turpiter et misere grassatur. Cum enim erronea, prava et absona hæc sint, non eam vim profecto habent, ut humanam familiam perficiant et prosperitate fortunent, *miseros enim facit populos peccatum*;* sed omnino necesse est, ut mentibus et cordibus corruptis, ipsa in omnem labem pondere suo populos detrudant, rectum quemque ordinem labefactent, atque ita reipublicæ conditionem et tranquillitatem serius ocus ad ultimum exitium adducant.

Quid autem, si Romani Pontificatus opera spectantur, iniquius esse potest, quam inficiari quantopere Romani Antistites de universa civili societate et quam egregie sint meriti? Profecto Decessores Nostri, ut populorum bono prospicerent, omnis generis tentamina suscipere, graves exantlare labores, seque asperis difficultatibus objicere nunquam dubitarunt: et defixis in cælo oculis neque improborum minis submisere frontem, neque blanditiis aut pollicitationibus se ab officio abduci degeneri assensu passi sunt. Fuit hæc Apostolica Sedes, quæ dilapsæ societatis veteris reliquias collegit et coagmentavit; hæc eadem fax amica fuit, qua humanitas christianorum temporum effulsit; fuit hæc salutis anchora inter sævissimas tempestates, quæ humana progenies jactata est; sacrum fuit concordie vinculum quod nationes dissitas moribusque diversas inter se consociavit: centrum denique commune fuit, unde cum fidei et religionis doctrina, tum pacis et rerum gerendarum auspicia ac consilia petebantur. Quid multa? Pontificum Maximorum laus est, quod constanter se pro muro et propugnaculo obiecerint, ne humana societas in superstitionem et barbariem antiquam relaberetur.

Utinam autem salutaris hæc auctoritas neglecta nunquam esset vel repudiata! Profecto neque civilis Principatus augustum et sacrum illud amisisset decus, quod a religione inditum præferebat, quodque unum parendi conditionem homine dignam nobilemque efficit; neque exarsissent tot seditiones et bella, quæ calamitatibus et cædibus terras funestarunt; neque regna olim florentissima, e prosperitatis culmine dejecta, omnium ærumnarum pondere premerentur. Cujus rei exemplo etiam sunt Orientales populi, qui abruptis suavissimis vinculis, quibus cum Apostolica hac Sede jungebantur, primævæ nobilitatis splendorem, scientiarum et artium laudem, atque imperii sui dignitatem amiserunt.

Præclara autem beneficia, quæ in quamlibet terræ plagam ab Apostolica Sede profecta esse illustria omnium temporum monumenta declarant, potissimum persensit Itala hæc regio, quæ quanto eidem propinquior loci natura extitit, tanto uberiores fructus ab ea percepit. Romanis certe Pontificibus Italia acceptam referre debet solidam gloriam et amplitudinem, qua reliquis inter gentes eminuit. Ipsorum auctoritas paternumque studium

* Prov. xiv. 33.

non semel ab hostium impetu textit, eidemque levamen et opem attulit, ut catholica fides nullo non tempore in Itatorum cordibus integra custodiretur.

Hujusmodi Prædecessorum Nostrorum merita, ut cætera prætereamus, maxime testatur memoria temporum S. Leonis Magni, Alexandri III., Innocentii III., S. Pii V., Leonis X. aliorumque Pontificum, quorum opera vel auspiciis ab extremo excidio, quod a barbaris impendebat, Italia sospes evasit, incorruptam retinuit antiquam fidem, atque inter tenebras squa-loreque rudioris ævi scientiarum lumen et splendorem artium aluit, vigentemque servavit. Testatur Nostra hæc alma Urbs Pontificum Sedes, quæ hunc ex iis fructum maximum cepit, ut non solum arx fidei munitissima esset, sed etiam bonarum artium asy- lum et domicilium sapientiæ effecta, totius urbis erga se admirationem et observantiam conciliaret. Cum harum rerum amplitudo ad æternam memoriam monumentis historiæ sit tradita, facili negotio intelligitur non potuisse nisi per hostilem voluntatem indignamque calumniam, ad hominum deceptionem, voce ac literis obtrudi, hanc Apostolicam Sedem civili populorum culti et Italiæ felicitati impedimento esse.

Si igitur spes omnes Italiæ Orbisque universi in ea vi communi utilitati et bono saluberrima, qua Sedis Apostolicæ pollet auctoritas, et in arcissimo nexu sunt positæ, qui omnes Christi fideles cum Romano Pontifice devinci-ant, nihil Nobis potius esse debere cognoscimus, quam ut Romanæ Cathedralis suam dignitatem sartam tectamque servemus, et membrorum cum Capite, filiorum cum Patre conjunctionem magis magisque firmemus.

Quapropter ut in primis, eo quo possumus modo, jura libertatemque hujus Sanctæ Sedis adseramus, contendere nunquam desinemus, ut auctori- tati Nostræ suum constet obsequium, ut obstacula amoveantur, quæ plenam ministerii Nostri potestatisque libertatem impediunt, atque in eam rerum conditionem restituamur, in qua divinæ Sapientiæ consilium Romanos Antistites jampridem collocaverat. Ad hanc vero restitutionem postulandam movemur, Venerabiles Fratres, non ambitionis studio aut dominationis cupiditate; sed officii Nostri ratione et religiosi jurisjurandi vinculis quibus obstringimur; ac præterea non solum ex eo quod principatus hic ad plenam libertatem spiritualis potestatis tuendam conservandamque est necessarius; sed etiam quod exploratissimum est, cum de temporali Principatu Sedis Apostolicæ agitur, publici etiam boni et salutis totius humanæ societatis causam agitari. Hinc prætermittere non possumus, quin pro officii Nostri munere, quo Sanctæ Ecclesiæ jura tueri tenemur, declarationes et protestationes omnes, quas sa. me. Pius IX. Decessor Noster tum adversus occupationem civilis Principatus, tum adversus violationem jurium ad Romanam Ecclesiam pertinentium pluries edidit ac iteravit, easdem et Nos hisce Nostris litteris omnino renovemus et confirmemus. Simul autem ad Principes et supremos populorum Moderatores voces Nostras convertimus, eosque per nomen augustum Summi Dei etiam atque etiam obtestamur, ne oblatam sibi tam necessario tempore opem Ecclesiæ repudient, atque uti consentientibus studiis circa hunc fontem auctoritatis et salutis amice cæant, Eique intimi amoris et observantiæ vinculis magis magisque jungantur. Faxit Deus, ut illi, comperta eorum quæ diximus veritate, ac secum reputantes doctrinam Christi, ut Augustinus aiebat,

*magnam, si obtemperetur, salutem esse reipublicæ** et in Ecclesiæ incolumitate et obsequio suam etiam ac publicam incolumitatem et tranquillitatem contineri, cogitationes suas et curas conferant ad levanda mala, quibus Ecclesia ejusque visibile Caput affligitur, atque ita tandem contingat, ut populi quibus præsunt, justitiæ et pacis ingressi viam, felici ævo prosperitatis et gloriæ fruantur.

Deinde autem ut totius catholici gregis cum supremo Pastore concordia firmior in dies adseratur, Vos hoc loco peculiari cum affectu appellamus, Venerabiles Fratres, et vehementer hortamur, ut pro sacerdotali zelo et pastoralis vigilantia Vestra fideles Vobis creditos religionis amore incendatis, quo propius et arctius huic Cathedræ veritatis et justitiæ adhæreant; omnes ejus doctrinas intimo mentis et voluntatis assensu suscipiant; opiniones vero etiam vulgatissimas, quas Ecclesiæ documentis oppositas noverint, omnino rejiciant. Qua in re Romani Pontifices Decessores Nostri, ac demum sa. me. Pius IX., præsertim in œcumenico Vaticano Concilio, præ oculis habentes verba Pauli: *Videte ne quis vos decipiat per philosophiam et inanem fallaciam secundum traditionem hominum, secundum elementa mundi et non secundum Christum*,† haud prætermiserunt, quoties opus fuit, grassantes errores reprobare et apostolica censura confodere. Has condemnationes omnes, Decessorum Nostrorum vestigia sectantes, Nos ex hac Apostolica veritatis Sede confirmamus ac iteramus, simulque Patrem luminum enixe rogamus, ut fideles omnes perfecti in eodem sensu eademque sententia idem Nobiscum sapiant, idemque loquantur. Vestri autem muneris est, Venerabiles Fratres, sedulam impendere curam, ut cælestium doctrinarum semen late per Dominicum agrum diffundatur et catholicæ fidei documenta fidelium animis mature inserantur, altas in eis radices agant, et ab errorum contagione incorrupta serventur. Quo validius contendunt religionis hostes imperitis hominibus, ac juvenibus præsertim, ea discenda proponere quæ mentes obnubilent moresque corrumpant, eo alacrius adnitendum est, ut non solum apta ac solida institutionis methodus, sed maxime institutio ipsa catholicæ fidei omnino conformis in litteris et disciplinis vigeat, præsertim autem in philosophia, ex qua recta aliarum scientiarum ratio magna ex parte dependet; quæque non ad evertendam divinam revelationem spectat, sed ad ipsam potius sternere viam gaudet, ipsamque ab impugnatoribus defendere, quemadmodum nos exemplo scriptisque suis Magnus Augustinus, et Angelicus Doctor, cæterique sapientiæ Magistri docuerunt.

Optima porro juventutis disciplina ad veræ fidei et religionis munimen atque ad morum integritatem a teneris annis exordium habeat necesse est in ipsa domestica societate; quæ nostris hisce temporibus misere perturbata, in suam dignitatem restituti nullo modo potest nisi iis legibus, quibus in Ecclesia ab ipsomet divino Auctore est instituta. Qui cum matrimonii fœdus, in quo suam cum Ecclesia conjunctionem significatam voluit, ad Sacramenti dignitatem evexerit, non modo maritalem unionem sanctiorem

* Ep. 138, alias 5, ad Marcellinum, n. 15.

† Ad Coloss. ii. 8.

effecit, sed etiam efficacissima tum parentibus tum proli paravit auxilia, quibus, per mutuorum officiorum observantiam, temporalem ac æternam felicitatem facilius assequerentur. At vero postquam impiæ leges, Sacramenti hujus magni religionem nil pensi habentes, illud eodem ordine cum contractibus mere civilibus habuerunt, id misere consecutum est, ut, violata Christiani conjugii dignitate, cives legali concubinato pro nuptiis uterentur, conjuges fidei mutæ officia negligerent, obedientiam et obsequium nati parentibus detrectarent, domesticæ charitatis vincula laxarentur, et, quod deterrimi exempli est publicisque moribus infensissimum, persæpe malesano amoris perniciosæ ac funestæ discessionibus succederent. Hæc sane misera et luctuosa non possunt, Venerabiles Fratres, vestrum zelum non excitare ac movere ad fideles vigilantiam vestræ conceditis sedulo instantèrque monendos, ut dociles aures doctrinis adhibeant quæ christiani conjugii sanctitatem respiciunt, ac pareant legibus quibus Ecclesia conjugum natorumque officia moderatur.

Tum vero illud optatissimum consequetur quod singulorum etiam hominum mores et vitæ ratio reformetur; nam veluti ex corrupto stipite deteriores rami et fructus infelices germinant, sic mala labes, quæ familias depravat, in singulorum civium noxam et vitium tristi contagione redundat. Contra vero, domestica societate ad christianæ vitæ formam composita, singula membra sensim assuescent religionem pietatemque diligere, a falsis perniciosisque doctrinis abhorrrere, sectarii virtutem, majoribus obsequi, atque inexhaustum illud privatæ dumtaxat utilitatis studium coercere, quod humanam naturam tantopere deprimit ac enervat. In quem finem non parum profecto conferet pias illas consociationes moderari et provehere, quæ magno rei catholicæ bono nostra maxime hac ætate constitutæ sunt.

Grandia quidem et humanis majora viribus hæc sunt, quæ spe et votis Nostris complectimur, Venerabiles Fratres; sed cum Deus sanabiles fecerit nationes orbis terrarum, cum Ecclesiam ad salutem gentium condiderit, eique suo se auxilio adfuturum usque ad consummationem sæculi promiserit, firmiter confidimus, adlaborantibus Vobis, humanum genus, tot malis et calamitatibus admonitum, tandem in Ecclesiæ obsequio, in hujus Apostolicæ Cathedræ infallibili magisterio salutem et prosperitatem quæsiturum.

Interea, Venerabiles Fratres, antequam finem scribendi faciamus, necesse est ut Vobis declarem gratulationem Nostram pro mira illa consensione et concordia, quæ animos Vestros inter Vos et cum hac Apostolica Sede in unum conjungit. Quam quidem perfectam conjunctionem non modo inexpugnabile propugnaculum esse contra impetus hostium arbitramur; sed etiam faustum ac felix omen quod meliora tempora Ecclesiæ spondet; ac dum eadem maximum solatium affert infirmitati Nostræ, etiam animum opportune erigit, ut in arduo, quod suscepimus, munere omnes labores, omnia certamina pro Ecclesia Dei alacriter sustineamus.

Ab hisce porro spei et gratulationis causis, quas Vobis patefecimus, sejungere non possumus eas significationes amoris et obsequii, quas in his Nostri Pontificatus exordiis Vos, Venerabiles Fratres, et una cum Vobis exhibuere humilitati Nostræ ecclesiastici viri et fideles quamplurimi, qui

litteris missis, largitionibus collatis, peregrationibus etiam peractis, nec non aliis pietatis officiis, ostenderunt devotionem et caritatem illam, qua meritissimum Prædecessorum Nostrum prosecuti fuere, adeo firmam, stabilem integramque manere, ut in persona tam imparis non tepescat heredis. Pro hisce splendidissimis catholicæ pietatis testimoniis humiliter confitemur Domino quia bonus et benignus est, ac Vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, cunctisque Dilectis Filiis, a quibus ea accepimus, gratissimos animi Nostri sensus ex intimo corde publice profitemur, plenam foventes fiduciam nunquam defuturum Nobis, in his rerum augustiis et temporum difficultatibus, hoc Vestrum ac fidelium studium et dilectionem. Nec vero dubitamus quin egregia hæc filialis pietatis et christianæ virtutis exempla plurimum sint valitura, ut Deus clementissimus, officiis hisce permotus, gregem suum propitius respiciat et Ecclesiæ pacem ac victoriam largiatur. Quoniam autem hanc pacem et victoriam ocus et facilius Nobis datum iri confidimus, si vota precesque constanter ad eam impetrandam fideles effuderint, Vos magnopere hortamur, Venerabiles Fratres, ut in hanc rem fidelium studia et fervorem excitetis, conciliatrice apud Deum adhibita Immaculata Cælorum Regina, ac deprecatoribus interpositis Sancto Josepho, Patrono Ecclesiæ cælesti, sanctisque Apostolorum Principibus Petro et Paulo, quorum omnium potenti patrocinio humilitatem Nostram, cunctos ecclesiasticæ hierarchiæ ordines ac dominicum gregem universum supplices commendamus.

Cæterum hos dies, quibus solemnem memoriam Jesu Christi resurgentis recolimus, Vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, et universo dominico gregi faustos salutare ac sancto gaudio plenos esse exoptamus, adprecantes benignissimum Deum, ut Sanguine immaculati Agni, quo deletum est chirographum quod adversus nos erat, culpæ quas contraximus deleantur, et iudicium quod pro illis ferimus clementer relaxetur.

Gratia Domini Nostri Jesu Christi et charitas Dei et communicatio Sancti Spiritus sit cum omnibus vobis, Venerabiles Fratres; quibus singulis universis, nec non et Dilectis Filiis Clero et fidelibus Ecclesiarum Vestrarum, in pignus præcipue benevolentiæ et in auspiciis cælestis præsidii Apostolicam benedictionem amantissime impertimus.

Datum Romæ apud Sanctum Petrum, die solemnî Paschæ, **xxi** Aprilis,

Anno **MDCCCLXXVIII.**

Pontificatus Nostri Anno primo.

LEO PP. XIII.

[AUTHORIZED TRANSLATION.*]

To His Venerable Brethren, all the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops and Bishops of the Catholic World, in favour and communion with the Apostolic See,

POPE LEO XIII.

VENERABLE BRETHREN,

Health and Apostolic Benediction.

RAISED as We have been, though all unworthy, by the unsearchable counsels of God, to the highest point of Apostolic Dignity, We have from the first moment felt ourselves constrained by a vehement desire to address you by letter : not only that We might put forth from Our inmost heart Our feelings of love for you ; but that also, seeing you have been called to bear part of Our burden, We might, in fulfilment of the office intrusted to Us by God, strengthen you to endure with Us the battle of these days in defence of God's Church and for the saving of souls.

From the first beginning of Our Pontificate, there has been before Our eyes the sad sight of the evils with which mankind to-day are everywhere burdened : the widespread attempt to overthrow those first truths by which, as in its foundations, the system of human society is bound together ; the wantonness of men's minds, which brooks no kind of lawful authority ; the never-ceasing causes of dissensions, whence spring civil struggles and savage and cruel wars ; the contempt of the laws which govern morality and protect the right ; the insatiable thirst for things that pass away, and the forgetfulness of things that last for ever, reaching even to so extreme a madness that men dread not in great numbers to lay hands upon themselves ; the reckless administration of public goods, which are wasted in the utmost confusion ; the shamelessness, moreover, of men who so manage as to seem the defenders of country, the defenders of liberty, and of every right, at the very moment when they are most betraying them all ; and lastly, that deadly plague which is creeping through every limb and joint of the whole body of human society, which gives it no rest, and threatens it with fresh and fresh revolution until it shall end in utter ruin.

The cause of these evils, We are convinced, lies chiefly in this, that men have despised and rejected the holy and most august authority of the Church, which in the Name of God rules over man, and is the protector and the bulwark of every lawful authority. And as the enemies of public order know this right well, they have reckoned that the most fitting way

* The following translation is that authorized by the English Bishops, and read to the people, by their Lordships' command, in all Catholic churches and chapels.

to tear up the foundations of society is to attack God's Church with unceasing onslaught; to bring upon it ill-will and hatred, by falsely representing it as the enemy of true civilisation; and thus, daily by fresh wounds, to weaken its authority and strength, and to overturn the supreme power of the Roman Pontiff, in whom the eternal and unchangeable ideas of good and right find their guardian and their champion upon earth. Hence in many countries, to Our sorrow, laws have been passed which pull to pieces the Divine constitution of the Church; the authority of the Bishops has been condemned; hindrances have been thrown in the way of ecclesiastics in the exercise of their ministry; religious communities have been scattered; the property by which the ministers of the Church and the poor were supported has been confiscated; public institutions, devoted to purposes of charity and beneficence, have been withdrawn from the useful management of the Church; and an unrestrained license has been given to teach and publish all things unholy, while the right which the Church has, to teach and train the young, is broken down and trampled on. The same has been the object of the seizure of that civil Principality which Divine Providence many centuries ago gave to the Roman Pontiff, in order that the power which he has received from Christ might be exercised for the eternal salvation of the world, in a manner free and untrammelled.

Of this mournful weight of troubles We have spoken, Venerable Brethren, not to increase your sorrow—for sorrow you have enough from these troubles without Our speaking; but because We think that so We shall most clearly explain to you how grave is the state of the affairs which demand Our ministry and Our zeal; and with what earnestness We must labour, in these unholy days especially, to defend and protect, in the midst of so many calumnies, the Church of Christ and the dignity of this Apostolic See to the very utmost of Our power.

We know with certainty, Venerable Brethren, that civilisation has no firm foundation unless it rests upon the eternal principles of truth and upon the unchangeable laws of right and justice; and unless true love binds the wills of men together, and harmonizes by its sweetness their mutual relations and duties to each other. Nor is there any one who can rightly deny that it is the Church which, by preaching the Gospel throughout the world, has carried the light of truth amongst nations who were brutalised and steeped in foul superstition, and has lifted them up to know the Divine Creator of the world and to recognise their own wretchedness; that it is the Church which has removed the misery of slavery, and thereby restored to men the first dignity and nobility of their nature; the Church which, unfurling the standard of redemption in every region of the world, has introduced or developed sciences and arts, founded and sheltered works of the highest charity for the relief of every kind of sorrow, everywhere civilised the human race in its public and private life, rescued it from its misery, and brought it by every possible effort to a manner of life befitting the dignity and the hope of man. If any unprejudiced man would compare this age in which we live, all hostile as it is to Religion and Christ's Church, with those most happy times in which

the Church received a mother's honour from the world, most surely would he find that this age of ours, full of disturbance, and pulling all things down, is rushing by a straight and rapid road to its destruction ; but that those days enjoyed excellent institutions, untroubled peace, wealth and prosperity, in the exact proportion in which the nations paid obedience to the direction and laws of the Church. If, however, those numberless benefits which We have now mentioned, as springing from the ministry and useful labours of the Church, are the true work and glory of civilisation, then it is by no means the case that Christ's Church is a foe to civilisation, or rejects it : rather may she claim, that to her by every title belongs the praise of being to civilisation a fostering nurse and mother.

That kind of so-called civilisation, however, which would be at variance with the doctrines and laws of holy Church, cannot be regarded as other than a mockery of true civilisation, a mere name without a substance. A clear proof of this is afforded by those nations on whom the light of the Gospel has not shone ; in whose lives a certain colour of civilisation can be seen, but its solid and true benefits are not there. Certainly, that cannot be deemed the perfection of civilised life in which every lawful power is boldly contemned ; nor is that to be counted liberty which holds shameful and wretched riot in the unbridled propagation of error, in the free satisfying of low desires, in unpunished deeds of shame and sin, and in tyranny over good men of every social rank. For since these things are full of error, since they distort and are out of harmony with our nature, they cannot certainly have power to perfect the family of man and make it prosperous, for "sin maketh nations miserable."* Nay it cannot be but that these things, having corrupted men's minds and hearts, should by their own weight thrust down the nations into every wickedness, give insecurity to all that was rightly ordered, and so, sooner or later, drag on the State which was before settled and peaceful into uttermost destruction.

And if we look at the history of the Popes of Rome, what can be more unjust than to deny how much, how far above all others, the Roman Pontiffs have deserved from the whole of civilised society ? Most certainly Our Predecessors, that they might provide for the good of the nations, never hesitated to take on themselves struggles of every kind, to go through severe labours, to expose themselves to rude difficulty : fixing their eyes on Heaven, they neither lowered that gaze before the threats of the wicked, nor suffered themselves to be drawn away from the straight path of duty by any unworthy yielding to flattery or promise. It was this Apostolic See which, when the old world fell to pieces, gathered and banded together the remnants of its order ; this See was the friendly torch by which the light of Christian civilisation shone forth ; this the saving anchor amidst the fierce storms by which the human race was tossed ; this the sacred bond of unity which, when nations were sundered in position and in character, still held them bound to one another ; this, in fine, was the common centre from which were sought both teaching in religious faith, and guidance and advice in the affairs of peace. In a word, it is

* Prov. xiv. 34.

the glory of the Popes that with one consent they have thrown themselves before human society as a wall and tower of defence, lest it should slip back again into its former barbarism and superstition.

Would that this useful authority had never been neglected nor cast away! Then, certainly, neither would the sovereign power of the State have lost that august and sacred dignity with which Religion clothed it, and which alone makes the obedience of a subject worthy of man and noble; nor would there have blazed forth the many civil strifes and wars which have made whole lands sad with distress and death; nor would kingdoms, which erewhile were flourishing, be now cast down from the height of their prosperity, lying crushed beneath the weight of every kind of sorrow. An illustration of this is found in the nations of the East, who cast off the gentle yoke which held them to the Apostolic See, and have now lost the splendour of their early nobleness, the glory of sciences and arts, and the dignity of empire.

These splendid blessings, as the records of all ages clearly show, went forth from the Apostolic See into every corner of the earth; but above all other nations have they been felt by our own country of Italy, which, as it is nearer in situation to the Apostolic See, so has received from it more abundant benefits. Certainly, it is to the Roman Pontiffs that Italy should attribute her true glory and magnificence, by which she has stood eminent amongst the nations of the world. The authority of the Popes it is, and their fatherly care, which, not once only, has shielded Italy from the attack of foes, and has brought to it such help and power that never has the moment been when the Catholic Faith was not guarded in its fulness within the hearts of Italians.

For such merits of Our Predecessors, that We may not record all, We would especially call in witness the times of St. Leo the Great, Alexander III., Innocent III., St. Pius V., Leo X., and other Pontiffs, by whose labour or guidance Italy came forth unhurt from the danger of utter destruction by barbarians; held uncorrupt her ancient Faith; and, amidst the darkness and wretchedness of an uncivilised age, cherished the light of the sciences and the splendour of the arts, bade them live, and preserved their life. Witness this City of Ours, Our fostering mother and the seat of the Pontiffs, which through them, to its great advantage, has not only become the strongly fortified citadel of the Faith, but has become moreover an asylum of the fine arts and the home of learning, so as to draw upon itself the admiring gaze of the whole world. And since the story of these magnificent benefits has been handed down in the records of history to the memory of man for ever, it is easy to be seen that by no other means but the determined will of foes and unworthy slander could men have been beguiled, by word and writing thrust upon them, into believing that the Apostolic See is a hindrance to the civilisation of the world and to the happiness of Italy.

If, then, all the hopes of Italy and of the entire world lie in that strength which is most to the advantage and the interests of all—in the strength of authority which resides in the Apostolic See, and in the firmness of the bond which should unite all Christians with the Roman Pontiff, We

recognise that nothing should be dearer to Us than to preserve to the See of Rome its rightful dignity whole and unimpaired, and to strengthen more and more the union of the limbs with the head, of the sons with the Father.

Wherefore, that We may as a chief duty assert, as best We can, the rights and freedom of this Holy See, We will never cease to strive that there may be rendered to Our authority its fitting homage, that all obstacles may be removed which shackle the full freedom of Our ministry and power, and that We may be restored to that old condition of things in which the counsels of Divine Wisdom had long ago placed the Popes of Rome. When, however, We demand this restitution, We are moved to do so, Venerable Brethren, not by any thought of ambition or desire of lording it, but by the very nature of the office which We hold, and by the religious obligations of the oath which binds Us: and, in addition to this, because Our civil principedom is needful to ward and to keep entire the full freedom of Our spiritual power; and again, because it is proved by all experience, that when there is question of the Temporal Power of the Apostolic See, the cause which is really at stake is the cause of the world's good and the safety of the whole society of man. Hence, as needs We must, if We would fulfil the duty by which We are bound to defend the rights of Holy Church, all declarations and protestations of every kind which Our Predecessor of holy memory, Pius IX., has many a time issued and repeated both against the seizure of the civil dominions, and against the violation of the rights which belong to the Roman Church—all these We too by this Our Letter do altogether renew and confirm. At the same time also We address Ourselves to the Kings and supreme Rulers of the nations; and, by the dread name of the great God, We again and again implore them not to reject the Church's aid offered to them now at their time of need, but rather, with one consent, to gather as friends around this source of authority and safety, and to unite themselves to it more and more in the bonds of closest love and duty. God grant that, seeing the truth of the words which We have spoken, and reflecting that the faith of Christ is, as St. Augustine says, "a great protection to the State, if it be obeyed,"* and that in the safety of the Church and the homage paid to it the peace and safety of themselves also and their people is bound up, they may turn their careful thoughts to lightening the ills with which the Church and her Visible Head is afflicted; and that so at last it may come to pass that the nations over which they rule may enter the path of righteousness and peace, and thus enjoy a happy age of prosperity and glory. And that the whole Catholic flock may be united to their supreme Pastor in daily increasing concord, We here appeal more-over to you, Venerable Brethren, with special earnestness, and We exhort you with all Our power, in your priestly zeal and pastoral watchfulness, to kindle in the hearts of the Faithful committed to you the love of Religion; that so with closer union they may cling to this Chair of truth and right; and, while they receive all its teachings with an inward assent of mind

* Ep. 138, alias 5, ad Marcellinum, n. 15.

and will, may wholly reject all opinions, however widespread, which they know to be opposed to the doctrines of the Church. In this matter the Roman Pontiffs, Our Predecessors, and last of all Pius IX. of holy memory, especially in the Œcumenical Vatican Council, having before their eyes the words of St. Paul—"Beware lest any man cheat you by philosophy and vain deceit; according to the tradition of men, according to the elements of the world, but not according to Christ"—*—have never omitted to condemn, as often as need was, all prevailing errors, and to pierce them with the sword of Apostolic censure. All these condemnations We, following the footsteps of Our Predecessors, do now from this Apostolic Seat of truth confirm and renew; and at the same time We earnestly entreat the Father of Lights that all the Faithful, made perfect in one mind and one thought, may have one knowledge and one speech with Ourselves. It is for you, Venerable Brethren, to take diligent heed that the seed of heavenly truths be widely scattered throughout the Lord's field; and that the doctrines of the Catholic Faith be planted in due season in the minds of the Faithful, take deep root in them, and be kept incorrupt from the contagious blight of error. The more strongly the enemies of Religion try to teach the unwary, and especially the young, such things as would darken their minds and corrupt their morals, so much the more vigorously must we strive, that not only a good and solid method of education may prevail, but that, above all, the education itself may be such as may in all points, both in literature and in science, be conformable to the Catholic Faith. Especially must this be so in Philosophy, from which the soundness of all other sciences in great part depends; and which does not tend to the overthrow of Divine revelation, but delights rather to prepare the way for it and to defend it from assailants, as we are taught by the example and the writings of the great Augustine, the Angelic Doctor, and the other masters of Christian wisdom.

But still further, the training of youth cannot be perfect, so as to constitute a bulwark to defend true faith and Religion and to preserve morality unhurt, unless it begins from the child's earliest years and in the bosom of the family; and the family in these our days has been so broken up, that in no way can it be restored to its proper dignity except by the observance of the laws on which it was established within the Church by its Divine Author. For, when He raised the bond of marriage to the dignity of a Sacrament, wishing it to be a sign of His own union with His Church, He not only made wedlock more holy; but He provided also aids full of power, both for parents and for children, by which, doing their duty one to another, they might more easily obtain happiness in time and in eternity. But when impious laws, holding the religious bond of this great Sacrament as of no account, placed it on a level with merely civil contracts, the unhappy consequences were, that, breaking down the dignity of Christian marriage, men used for marriage a legalized concubinage; that the duties of fidelity between husband and wife were not

* Coloss. ii. 8.

regarded ; that children withheld from parents obedience and respect ; that the bonds of family love were loosened ; and that — worst of all examples, most hostile to public morality—an unholy love was very often followed by a disastrous and sorrowful divorce. All this is so full of misery and sorrow, Venerable Brethren, that it cannot fail to rouse your zeal, and to urge you unceasingly and earnestly to warn the Faithful committed to your care, so that they may lend willing ears to the Church's doctrine on the holiness of marriage, and may obey the laws by which the Church directs the duties of the married and of their children. Then indeed will follow this most desirable result, that the lives of individuals will be reformed : for as, if the stem of a tree be rotten, the branches are unsound and the fruit poor, so the plague which corrupts the family spreads on, with its sad contagion, to injure and corrupt the individual. On the contrary, if the family be ordered on the Christian model, each member of it will insensibly form the habit of loving religion and piety, of shrinking from false and pernicious doctrine, of living virtuously, of respecting superiors, and of keeping in check that spirit of self-interest which so much lowers and takes the strength from the nature of man. To this end much will be contributed by the management and promotion of those pious associations which have been established, especially in these days, to the great good of Catholicity.

Great things indeed are these, Venerable Brethren, for which We hope and pray, and far beyond the strength of man : but since God has opened a way to heal the nations of the earth, since He has founded His Church for the salvation of the world, and has promised that He will be with it, to aid it, even to the end of time, We have a firm trust that, by your working with Us, mankind will take warning from these many evils and calamities, and will at length seek their safety and prosperity in obedience to the Church and in the infallible teaching of this Apostolic See.

Meanwhile, Venerable Brethren, before We bring this Letter to a close, We cannot help expressing to you Our congratulations on the wonderful unanimity and concord which binds you in perfect unity one to another, and to this Apostolic See. This perfection of unity We hold to be not only an impregnable defence against the assaults of foes, but a blessed and gracious omen which is a pledge of happier times for the Church ; and while it gives support to Our weakness, it gives Us also the courage which the times require, that We may bear with joy, in the high office which We have undertaken, every kind of toil and every kind of contest for the Church of God.

To the causes of hope and joy which We have mentioned, We cannot omit to add those displays of love and respect which in the very beginning of Our Pontificate we have received, unworthy as We are, from yourselves, Venerable Brethren ; and, with you, from large numbers of the Clergy and the Faithful, who by letter, by offerings, by pilgrimages, and by other acts of affection, have shown that the well-merited devotion and love which they had for Our Predecessor remains so firmly settled and entire, that even towards the person of an heir so unequal to himself it does not lose its warmth. For these most splendid proofs of Catholic affection We

praise Our good and gracious God ; and to yourselves, Venerable Brethren, and all Our dear Children from whom We have received them, We offer from Our inmost heart Our public thanks, feeling fullest confidence that, in all Our straits and all difficulties of the times, there never will be wanting to Us this zealous love of yourselves and of the Faithful. Nor do We doubt but that these great examples of filial affection and Christian virtue will plead with Our most merciful God, so that in answer to this love He will look graciously upon His flock, and will grant peace and victory to His Church. As, however, We know that this peace and victory will be granted to Us more quickly and more easily if the Faithful constantly pour forth their prayers to obtain it, We earnestly exhort you, Venerable Brethren, to excite the Faithful to be fervent in their efforts, begging the Immaculate Queen of Heaven to plead for Us with God, and asking the intercession of St. Joseph, heavenly Patron of the Church, and of the holy Princes of the Apostles SS. Peter and Paul ; to the powerful patronage of all of whom We humbly commend Ourselves, in Our unworthiness, together with all the ranks of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy and the whole Flock of Our Lord.

In conclusion, Venerable Brethren, We wish that these days in which we are keeping solemn festival in memory of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, may be to you and to the Lord's whole Flock days of happiness, and grace, and holy joy ; and We pray Our most gracious God that the Blood of the Immaculate Lamb, by which the handwriting that was against us has been blotted out, may blot out the faults which we have committed and mercifully relax the condemnation which we bear for them.

The grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ, and the charity of God, and the communication of the Holy Spirit, be with you all, Venerable Brethren. To all and each of you, and to Our beloved Children the Clergy and the Faithful of your Churches, as a pledge of Our special love and in token of the Divine protection, We most lovingly impart Our Apostolic Benediction.

Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, on Easter Day, April the 21st, 1878, in the first year of Our Pontificate.

POPE LEO XIII.

Notices of Books.

The Temporal Power of the Holy See: a Pastoral for Lent, 1860. By Card. PECCI, now LEO XIII. Translated by a Priest. London: James Duffy & Sons.

The Church and Civilisation, Part Second: a Pastoral for Lent, 1878. By Card. PECCI, now LEO XIII. Translated by a Priest. Dublin: Gill & Son.

WE shall speak of these two Pastorals in no other spirit and with no other purpose, than we professed in our April number (p. 505) when noticing the first part of Card. Pecci's Essay on "The Church and Civilisation." We shall not presume to comment on them except in one respect; viz., with the purpose of pointing out how egregious—nay how absolutely inexplicable—is the mistake of those, who fancy that Card. Pecci's doctrine, on the matters treated by him, fails of being in full harmony with that of Pius IX. A few extracts will make our conclusion abundantly clear.

First then, as regards the temporal sovereignty of the Holy See:—

"The spiritual primacy over the entire Church carries with it a repugnance in concept with temporal subjection. It is quite true that in the first centuries the Pontiff had not the independence of the Principedom, but that of martyrdom; . . . and hence the Roman Pontiffs of that time were subject in fact to lay princes; but an instance cannot be conceived in which they were bound by right to that state of subjection. The supreme spiritual power of the Pontificate bore in its womb from its very origin the germ of the temporal power" (Pastoral of 1860, pp. 9, 10).

"The obstinate war which the impious wage against the Vicar of Jesus Christ, to snatch from his brow his crown as temporal prince, is too manifest a proof of the importance of that crown for the efficacious exercise of the spiritual authority. They hate that crown, because they see the help it affords to the religion whose death they have sworn" (p. 14).

"If it is proved that this is the possible end in view, it is clear that there is here no middle way for us. We must take our stand either with Christ and the Church, . . . or we must join the foe against God and His Church. This is no longer a matter of policy; it is a matter of conscience" (p. 17).

Finally, in regard to "those ideas" "through which endeavour is made to dispose the people to favour the war" against the Pope's civil principedom, Card. Pecci pronounces that "in substance they are exactly the same as those which the Church already condemned in the Apostolicals of the

third century, or in Marsilius of Padua, or in Wicliffe, Hus, Arnold of Brescia, and other heretics" (p. 3).

In the Pastoral of 1878 Card. Pecci "bitterly deplores the apostasy of the governments that represent social power." "Still," he adds, "we cannot mistake the fact that, side by side with this official and depraved godless world, there is another real world, in which is found a great number of beneficent hearts, of firm characters, of pure and high souls" (p. 8).

[In these days] "morality, snatched from the hands of the Church and treacherously stripped of its religious basis, has remained floating in the air, has ceased to be the authorized rule of actions, has become the sport and the vile tool of all sorts of passions" (p. 33).

And, in the conclusion, written after Pius IX.'s death, he thus speaks of that Pontiff:—

"God . . . has been pleased to give him the eternal recompense to which he had gained a right by the long and precious services which he had rendered to the Church; by his undying acts; by his sufferings, endured with so much constancy, with so much dignity and apostolical firmness" (pp. 35, 36).

We have to thank the "Priest" for his excellent and most readable translation.

The Christian Life and Virtues considered in the Religious State. By Mgr. CHARLES GAY, Coadjutor to the Bishop of Poitiers. Translated from the Sixth French Edition by the Right Rev. ABBOT BURDER. Vol. I. London: Burns & Oates. 1878.

THE work of Mgr. Gay challenges the most searching criticism. It has been approved by many bishops in terms of exceptional praise, and has brought the writer letters of congratulation from all quarters. Granting that the unstinted, indeed, overpowering, eulogium passed on the work must be accepted minus something for the friendship of the writers, and the usual courtesy shown in letters of thanks "to the author," it is plain, nevertheless, that it has made a deep impression on French Catholics, and has placed the author in the first rank of modern spiritual writers. As we have the translation of only one of the two volumes, which are published in French and are to be followed by a third, we cannot attempt a comprehensive view of the work. As far as we can judge, the plan of the whole work, differing in many respects from the usual form of ascetical treatises, is thoughtful and logical. At least good reasons are assigned for the sequence of the six treatises on "the Christian Life," "the Religious State," "Faith," "the Fear of God," "Christian Hope," and "Humility," contained in this first volume. But as the special characteristics of the writing assert themselves as plainly in one volume as they will in many, we point out two or three as showing its value.

We mark with pleasure the prominence of dogmatic teaching throughout the work. It is the result of a well-weighed intention; for the author,

justly regretting that so much spiritual writing is (though he does not say so in these words) "stale, flat, and unprofitable" on account of its want of dogmatic teaching, aims at making the theology of the Church the principles of his writing and the guiding power of the spiritual life. The truths of faith are incomparably higher than pure ethics, and more specially Christian in character; and are therefore better fitted to inspire a high asceticism than ethical principles, even though these latter are ornamented with illustrations from Holy Writ and the lives of the Saints. For instance, a chapter on humility, or charity, in which the purely moral considerations of these virtues are treated, can never influence the human soul like a chapter in which the humility or charity of the mystery of the Incarnation is theologically described. Ethics are a world-wide possession, dogma is the glory of the Church. The faithful are children of a revealed light, chosen to bring forth works of light; and that light, which is faith, must be the penetrating and surrounding element of their lives. We fully agree with the conviction that asserts itself in every page, that the foundation of the Christian life, the clearest teaching of its duties, the inspiration of its virtues, and the highest ideal of supernatural attainment, should be looked for in the dogmas of faith; and we can answer for the result of his definite aim, to elevate ascetical teaching by the use of dogmatic theology, as justifying his view. His thoughts are always fresh and forcibly expressed; he rarely moralizes; he is able to write page after page on the fundamental virtues, without drifting into the commonplaces of spiritual writers. It is only right for us to state that the work is, from its very character, above the apprehension of readers whose acquaintance with theological questions is confined to the penny catechism, and may therefore be judged wanting in simplicity. But after all, has not that often-used objection of readers, and even of critics, been allowed in too many instances to condemn to oblivion thoughtful and ably-written works? Authors may justly answer that their writings are *caviare* to those whose tastes are not cultivated above indulgence in the light literature of the age. It is fitting, indeed, that there should be "milk" for "little ones," but the little ones should develop a capacity for "meat." When an author does his utmost to bring useful lessons of faith as well within the reach of ordinary intelligence as the truths allow, he can justly expect from his readers an effort to attain the lesson. It does not seem judicious for Catholic writers to ignore perpetually the wisdom of perfection, which lies hidden, like a buried treasure, in the theology of the Church, even though it be little appreciated for a time. The truth was given for the benefit of the faithful, and they must suffer great loss if not educated in it.

There is nothing very original in the second characteristic of the work, as far as the *purpose* of the writer is shown. He says in the preface: "What we have sought above all is to render Jesus Christ present in all parts of the book." Few writers on the spiritual life have a less ambitious intention. It is not often, however, that we find the purpose so well carried out, and the aim so decisively attained. Christ is steadfastly contemplated as the example and end of the moral law, and consequently of a Christian's duties. Because the writer's mind is filled with the theology

of the Incarnation, and has a singular gift of seeing in that great truth the Alpha and Omega of all the wars of Divine providence and all human perfection ; he pictures for us every moral truth, every counsel of perfection, every lesson of asceticism, as a gleam of that "light which enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world." In the chapter on "the Fear of God," we should naturally expect the intention of the writer and his subject-matter to be not easily harmonized. Yet there, the Divine example takes its place, as much the archetype as in any other virtue. We give an extract, which will serve the double purpose of illustrating the point, and showing the style of the work.

"Viewing it (fear) in its origin, it is a real communication to our soul of the idea God has of what is evil, of the judgment He forms of it, of the treatment He inflicts on it; in a word, of what we may call the attitude of God in respect of sin. 'God fears nothing,' says St. Thomas. He does not fear sin more than any other thing; but He hates sin, He holds it in horror and abomination. Now, this Divine hatred, passing into us, continues there a true hatred; but it becomes in us also a fear, because sin, which cannot touch God, can always stain and defile ourselves.

"Because it is thus founded on a likeness of mind and heart with God, the Scripture everywhere commands this fear as an act of wisdom. . . . It is this which also makes this fear so entirely filial. That light in which the soul unites itself to God, in order to apprehend it; that wisdom, which is its root, and its sap, in its first and essential reality, is the Word, the first-born of God, the Eternal and only-begotten of the Father. Now, to be united to this Word in the order of grace, is to become His Son; it is to receive from Him what is His; it is to share His heritage. So the more we have in us of that spirit which makes us turn towards God, exclaiming, 'Abba Father' (Rom. viii. 15), the more we shall fear sin" (p. 208).

From an earlier page we give another extract—a better example of the translator's work:—

"Besides—and the thought will give you light and a supreme consolation—we cannot doubt that our Lord, in passing through the different states of our humanity, Himself experienced this fear of the chastisements due to sin, chastisements that He Himself was to feel, as being laden with the sins of us all. This fear entered as a part—subordinate, indeed, and limited, but real—into the prelude of His agony, which the Holy Spirit describes in these words, which contain a fathomless depth of meaning: 'Then Jesus began to fear, and to be heavy, and to be sad' (St. Mark xiv. 33). . . . Whatever were the nature and extent of His fear, you understand there was nothing in it of infirmity, timidity, or weakness. As the Holy Spirit, in the beginning of the world, moved over the vast expanse of the waters, so the strength of Jesus, His unalterable patience, His invincible obedience, His triumphant love, brooded over the immense undulations and the unspeakable tempests of His soul. But also, being Man like ourselves, and bearing the image of sinners; holding their place, and becoming their surety; being for them Priest and Victim, rigorously paying our debts, meriting for us all grace, and giving us an example of all virtues; He did not spare Himself our fears. He truly trembled, and His heart became, as ours would have become, heavily oppressed; and It grew chill and weak when He saw and felt the torrents of Divine vengeance fall upon him. All this is written of Him prophetically in many places in the Psalms, and with a clearness, a vigour, and a detail

which, leaving no room to doubt the application, move the Christian soul o its lowest depths" (p. 204).

Some French readers have pointed out that the whole of the book appears to be founded on the great Franciscan doctrine, according to which "the Word would have been made Flesh, even if Adam had not sinned," and regretted that a theological opinion should have been chosen as a foundation for the work. Leaving aside the question, whether it is to be regretted or not, we must agree with the nameless critics, in part at least ; and we cannot understand the denial of the author. If the teaching of the subtle Doctor, of Alexander of Hales (to whom the printer's punctuation has given a double personality) and of Suarez—teaching so clear to the best of our own spiritual writers, F. Faber—does not so constitute the foundation of the first treatise, that they must be accepted or rejected together, we must have read, and read it again, in a dream. The first fifty pages on the Christian Life are really an exposition of the Scotist view of the Incarnation ; and even to the end the same view is from time to time opening on us, now plainly, now obscurely, but always sufficiently declaring the theological opinion that underlies the whole work. We do not regret it ; we only state the fact.

We shall leave the ably-written volume to the judgment of its readers, with some brief intimations of other points. The title states that the work is for religious. But is not intended exclusively for them ; it is of the widest value. We have referred to the fact that it will tax the understanding of ordinary readers ; but the careful reading it deserves will enable most persons to appreciate the greater part. Even those whom a theological education has fitted for a thorough appreciation of the work, will also be likely to learn much from it. A quotation aptly made, or a thought developed, shows us how much more may be in an expression of the great theologians, or of the Fathers, or of the Holy Scriptures, than we had imagined. It is an additional merit of the volume that it shows us the value of the sources from which it has drawn its own riches. As we feel that we have done the work but feeble justice—said nothing of the new, and oftentimes bold, illustrations by which difficult truths are suggested, and little of the eloquence, which in some cases is of the highest order—we shall somewhat atone for an involuntary want of justice by quoting the eulogy of an eminent confessor of the faith, the Vicar-Apostolic of Geneva. He says that "the Christian Life and Virtues" takes its place "among those works which are the tradition, the life, and the glory of the Church," and contains that which we ask for all who enter the Church—"Doctrinam sanam, Scientiam veram, Consilium rectum."

The translation is clear, and preserves much of the elegance that has been attributed to the original ; but we suspect that a second edition will show many verbal changes.

Emotion. By ST. GEORGE MIVART (American Catholic Quarterly Review, April, 1878). Hardy & Mahony, 505, Chestnut-street, Philadelphia.

THIS article may have escaped the notice of many of our English readers, owing to its publication in an American Review; and we account it a paper of very considerable importance. Its main object, as it would seem, is to claim for our higher emotions—those closely connected with our intellectual and moral perceptions—a position among the higher mental phenomena; and to deprecate their being snubbed as they so often are, and voted a part of that lower nature which we share with the brutes. Without committing ourselves to every one of Dr. Mivart's statements, we confess to a great sympathy with the general drift of his argument. It has ever seemed to us the greatest of paradoxes that, e.g., a S. Philip Neri, in whose life we read of the wonderful miracles worked by his intense emotional love of God, should, when summoned to receive his reward, be suddenly stripped of all affections and feelings (for a cleaving of the will to God, "as iron to a magnet," can be called neither), and ascend to heaven, bare intellect and will, robbed of so much that was attractive and beautiful in him, which seemed so closely connected with his sanctity while on earth. To say nothing else, it is hard to see how his soul is to be thus possessed of the highest bliss, when he has no longer any feelings with which to enjoy it. This is very ably put by Dr. Mivart (p. 307).

"We are sometimes told by religious expounders of the scholastic philosophy that all 'feeling' is 'corporeal,' and that such mental activities as love of virtue or of God reside in the *will*; also that in the state of disembodied spirit we cannot have feeling or emotions at all, since they belong essentially to the body. In that state, they tell us, we can have knowledge and volition only. It is difficult to suppose they can have observed the drift of their own language, when they imply that *feelings* of love are to be unknown by a deceased person till the Resurrection, and that his will is to cleave to God, as iron does to a magnet, without any feeling or emotion whatever. Tell us that our feeling of happiness is happiness *as we know it*, and our feeling of love *as we know it* are but symbols ever so inadequate of our feelings in heaven, and we shall not mind, if only they are true symbols, *as far as they go*—if they only fail, as our present knowledge fails, from inadequacy, not from mendacity. But tell us we shall have nothing corresponding to the feelings we can now experience, and our future bliss seems poor indeed."

Against those who assert that all feeling, as being corporeal, should rank among the lower mental phenomena, Dr. Mivart argues that the objection applies equally to our *knowledge*, which, "as we experience it, is necessarily corporeal, since . . . we cannot think our most abstract thoughts, save by the aid of sensuous phantasmata." As, then, with regard to the operations of our intellect, notwithstanding that sense plays so large a part in them (as Dr. Mivart points out), still, in classification, that part is ignored, and those operations are called *intellectual*, and considered as totally separate from mere sensuous perception; in the same manner intellect, as apprehending both speculative and moral truth, so complicates and affects

the nature of the higher emotions, as to make them properly rank in a class apart from the lower or sensuous emotions. In the second case, as in the first, *the whole character* of the mental phenomena depends on their intellectual and moral side; the sensuous accompaniment being, it is true, quite indispensable—as the organ-blower is to the organist—but also quite secondary and subservient. The cases are parallel, argues Dr. Mivart, and any objection which applies to such classification of emotion does so equally in the case of intellection. The idea which our moral faculty * gives us of “noble” or “good,” affects quite as radically the nature of our emotional admiration of noble or good acts, as does the intellectual notion of “necessity” our process of mind when we say, on seeing a trilateral figure, “This must have three angles.” Take away the ideas “noble,” “generous,” “must,” and in each case the whole essence of the mental act disappears.

We agree with Dr. Mivart where he implies (p. 315) that we Catholics sometimes tend to undervalue *feelings* of piety. We cannot, however, concur with him (p. 316), that such feelings may be meritorious *in themselves*; but would rather say that they are a good index to a pious state of mind, and are *accompanied* almost invariably by virtuous acts of the will.

We have been unable, through want of space, to do more than notice, in a disconnected manner, one or two of the passages which struck us in reading the article; but we hope that we may induce some of our readers to peruse the whole for themselves, and we can assure them that it will repay their trouble. Whether or no they ultimately agree with all which it contains, we are certain that they will finish it better psychologists than they began; with a much-increased knowledge of the various aspects of the subject; and with a deep sense of its interest, and of the many difficulties in the way of accepting a view substantially different from that which the writer advocates.

Proteus and Amadeus: a Correspondence. Edited by AUBREY DE VERE.
London: Kegan Paul & Co. 1878.

HERE, we imagine, is something that Charles Lamb, had he lighted upon it, would have owned for a genuine *book*, though it handles pure science and conducts us into the very centre of metaphysical disputing. He would have seen that it tells “an ower-true tale,” and have felt compassion for Proteus and his melancholy scepticism. For

* By the moral faculty, we mean only our intellect as apprehending moral truth, e.g., that ingratitude cannot be a virtue. Cf. Mivart, p. 304. One special word of praise is due to the admirably clear explanation, given at the beginning of the article, of the meaning of the word “faculty.” This makes the *reductio ad absurdum* of the view Dr. Mivart opposes very forcible and effective.

the letters which Mr. Aubrey de Vere has edited are clearly beyond the reach of feigning; their sadness, and the touches of gentle humour that relieve it, their fragmentary style, and abrupt, half-disappointing conclusion assure us that the whole is sincere work done for the purpose it indicates. It is a correspondence between two friends differing somewhat in age; for they once were master and pupil at a great Catholic school which, oddly enough, they have entitled Crowhurst; and, we dare say, each of them has a character and temperament of his own, but we discern some unmistakable affinity in their way of looking at the world, and at the perplexities of modern life. Especially do they agree that formal argument, however it may avail in controversy, does not vanquish or convert the spirit; and they are fain to invoke the help of another faculty that has in it more of the human, more perhaps of the divine. They know, as Emerson has said, that "a truth separated by the intellect is no longer a subject of destiny. It is eviscerated of care. For what is addressed to us for contemplation does not threaten, but makes us intellectual beings." But Proteus and Amadeus are men who have tasted sorrow; thoughts are troubling them "that lie too deep for tears"; and it is not curiosity, but something far more imperious in its demands, that urges them to question of the origin and the aim of things around and of themselves. Both, in earlier years, held the faith; Amadeus holds it still; but Proteus has fallen in with evil companions in the shape of German *savans*, and they have instructed him that the Creed is entirely opposed to physical science. To a certain demon, persuasive and highly-learned, he has yielded up his expectation of immortal life, and his belief in a Personal God. He has become a materialist *malgré lui*. The fair-spoken tempter, we grieve to say, is none other than Charles Darwin. He, in exchange for a now impossible tranquillity of conscience, has bestowed upon Proteus the theory that fatal selection accounts for everything, and that the fittest will survive. Modest Proteus formerly, indeed, held that the soul, if it be enamoured of Truth and Virtue, is the most excellent of things—nor can he discard so evident a sentence; but he is now taught that, in spite of its excellence, it will *not* survive. By inclination he is an artist, and he has written some beautiful and taking poetry. He knows, also, that the Reign of Law throughout the universe is acknowledged as a primary fact in the science of the day. But, thanks to the Darwinian argument, he can gather from the vision of beauty, order, and gladness which has entranced his gaze no more than the impotent conclusion, that unconscious matter is the infinite first cause. He would willingly confess, but it seems to him impossible, that the mind of a divine artist did, from all eternity, brood over the world in idea, and on a time bring it into the light of existence. But since evolution is blind and mechanical, how can any one accept the old proof from design that there is a God in Heaven? No, the scheme of things has lost its meaning, life is a perfect riddle, because from the very nature of it an answer is inconceivable to the question it propounds, and what can Proteus do to while away its tediousness except cultivate love and pleasure? But, like most of us, he has failed to pluck happiness out of the nettle, though it seemed a rose of May; he is disap-

pointed and flung back upon himself, and, as a last resource, he takes to *thinking*. For if the Creed were, after all, a message from the everliving God, and beatitude were something that goodness might win, he feels that hope would again spring up to comfort him, and serene days would efface the memories of a wasted youth. But, though he has grown acquainted with physical science, and letters, and modern life, he knows little of theology and has read scarcely a line in the Catholic philosophers. How, being merely a man of the world, can he begin the search after truth, or, unassisted by metaphysics, expect to attain it?

By an accident (call it rather the disposition of an all-seeing compassionate Providence) he resumes the intimacy of his old friendship with Amadeus. He proposes a discussion by letter on the mysterious questions that, if he cannot answer them, must darken all his days with gloom of scepticism. Is there a God? Is there an after-life for us? What reasons can be adduced that will, not leave him dumb and confuted, but convince him and fill his mouth with praise of the Living Mercy? To argue, in his present state, is worse than naught: he would be made to *see*. And Amadeus, happily enough, thinks himself "the worst controversialist in England," has absolutely no confidence in argument, but will think aloud in the hearing of his friend and say why *he* believes that God is all-knowing, just, beneficent, the reward of right-doing in an eternal world; experience for experience, he unfolds the history of his mind, as Proteus had done, and is sure that *egoism*, in a matter like this of life and death, will not be odious except on condition that it prove without effect. He believes in God naturally, and in a future judgment. But he can say a great deal on the grounds for believing. "There is a God or there is nothing," thus the argument flashed upon him in childhood. It convinces him still. And, turning to the world at large, he finds it is a mechanism framed in proportion and according to exquisite laws of number, a starry mathematics, or else an organism where beauty, adaptation, growth upon a plan, and even a most touching humour make themselves visible to the eye of him that looks. But what of Darwin? Is evolution true? and may Catholics believe in it and keep the faith? Amadeus answers that no theory can be true that allows the universe to be a display of reason, reason petrified, as it were, in atoms and their combinations, and yet denies that the primal cause is reasonable as well. Why not say that a sonnet may compose its own sense and music, if the world, that infinite and fairest poem, has fallen together by chance or unintelligent and unaccountable necessity? Is not the cause of a mental process a mind? Then evolution will not make away with God, for it is evolution that justifies, by exemplifying, objective reason, and shows us that *we* did not create the laws whose action we register. In like manner the instincts of animals prove that "God is as a mind to them which have none of their own"; for the bee cannot know those geometrical principles on which it builds, but there is some one that traces a plan for it. And, we may ask, cannot the infinite mind be viewed in history, where so many events have a dramatic fitness that men never prophesied nor purposed?

But natural selection, he would say, crudely as Darwin has set it forth, gives

no proper account of evolution. It has against it illustrious names and some certain facts. Amadeus himself, who has spent many hours in the solitude of country haunts, can bring forward difficulties from nature which Darwin, after sleepless nights, will not easily answer. Not that Amadeus would deny the agency of selection in carrying onward and upward the scheme of development from grade to grade. But he seeks the higher law which this may subserve. In days of intense thought and world-wide observation it ought not to stagger us if men grow contemptuous of the old disjointed method upon which the divine act of creation was sought to be exhibited. Evolution is a thought full of light and beauty. But Darwin has not seen the spiritual significance of it; and only a Catholic, such as Mr. St. George Mivart, can look out upon the vistas which so grand a theory has laid open. From him Amadeus is willing to quote. Mivart, perhaps without knowing it, has followed up a suggestion which, we cannot but think, St. Thomas in his doctrine of matter and substantial form, had long ago furnished. Forms are hidden potencies in matter, which it is the office of chemical and vital energies to strike out, as it were, and elicit, as sounds may be drawn from an instrument in answer to the touch of the musician. And applying the conception to, not one individual, but a multitude, we may see the rhythmic movement of nature (acting in obedience to the infinite first cause) which brings even larger potencies into act, and results in a new species. This does not clash with the profound saying of Amadeus that, in the present stage of the world's existence, we seem to have entered on a Sabbath of rest, that fresh organisms arise no more, and that the lower forms have indeed developed, but are not developing. For in the divine *rhythmus* it is likely that there are bars of rest, periods of secret and subtle preparation, and of fruitful silence. Thus, by assimilating the views of Mivart and Amadeus, we may understand what the naturalists have advanced in opposition to Darwin, viz., that whether we regard plants or animals, the present lines of demarcation between species are fixed and firm. This has been well shown by an eminent German writer (not a Catholic), from whom we could quote to some effect were the space at our disposal. We mean Professor Ulrici, a name which Continental Darwinians know and fear. But that evolution, in some better sense than Darwin's, was and is a recognized opinion in the Catholic schools, Amadeus brings out with great clearness; and the consequence is that Proteus, whilst abandoning Darwin, has more confidence than ever in the theory of evolution. But, as he says, being shown to have a method in its action, and to be no unintelligent law of mere matter, it cannot harm religion nor take away belief in God. And the monster, he had set up in the place of God, the Unconscious, does not long resist the strength of Amadeus, but, by a terrible *reductio ad absurdum*, is ground into powder.

Much still remains, for even if God be acknowledged, it is not clear that we may look for a life to come. Amadeus has proved himself a natural philosopher of striking ability; how does he fare in this new enterprise? Proteus seems to tell us that he will now believe in a future life, on condition that the body rise again, but he fails to perceive that the

soul can exist apart from an organism. And we think Amadeus was, at first, not so successful in dealing with the problem ; but his last remarks on personality leave not much to be desired. Butler, whom he follows here quite closely, led him astray, by making not enough of the substantial connection between the elements that constitute man. And we are further of opinion, that what may prove the brute soul to be indivisible will not prove it to be immortal, not, we mean, to a demonstration. The chief ground on which we hold a future life is, that the essential order of things, *rerum natura*, is a moral order, just as it is certainly a system of reason, and that the Creator could not refuse man his immortality and Himself remain good. For virtue must have absolute consequences, and these must be good ; whence absolute or unending beatitude must be its goal. But this reasoning we can hardly apply to the brutes, since they have no intuitions of good and evil, nor can choose between them. Questions that touch upon the brute creation are, indeed, full of mystery, but to connect man's future with theirs may oblige us to explain *obscurum per obscurius*. The method, at least, is not convincing.

In another subject, when Amadeus speaks of *substance* as a transcendental notion (which term he uses in a Kantian sense) does he mean that we *never* have a real experience of it, not even in our own souls ? We prefer the doctrine of S. Thomas, viz., that the intellect knows substance in and through its accidents ; and that the sense apprehends substance, but not *formaliter*, does not distinguish between that and the accidents, but grasps them *per modum unius*.

The whole book is beautiful and full of interest, though we feel that it is written in the minor key. It lacks the joyous spirit that in happier ages would have breathed itself out in discourses on the beauty of the universe, and on the Divine life which it conceals. But Proteus had no reason for rejoicing, he was sick unto death ; and Amadeus, the kindly physician, had caught something of his patient's despondency. Can the reader make certain that studies in mental pathology will do him no mischief ? Let him be quite sure before he goes into the company of Proteus. The epistles of Amadeus, distinguished as they are by quaint humour, sudden gleams of genius, and a rare and pleasant style, he cannot fail to peruse with advantage as great as his admiration of them. And that will not be small.

Memoirs of Georgiana, Lady Chatterton. Edited by EDWARD HENEAGE DERING. Hurst & Blackett.

IT is refreshing in these days of telegraphs, microphones, express trains, and sensational novels, to escape for awhile from the rush of the world, and live back in other days, when men were not subjected to the high pressure of the requirements of modern society.

Such a treat has been furnished us in the perusal of the "Memoirs" of his late wife, given to the world by Mr. Dering, at once a *monumentum doloris*, as well as a *pignus amoris*.

The extracts from the diary are well chosen ; the anecdotes bright, sparkling, and many of them new ; and they are connected together so unobtrusively, that we forget the editor in the narrator ; reminding us of a choice piece of cloisonné enamel, in which one fails to notice the golden threads that bind the parts together, in the general beauty and harmony of the whole.

The subject of these memoirs was born in London in the early part of the present century ; and, as she tells us, owed her first impressions and early education simply to the conversations of the many distinguished individuals who, from time to time, came to visit her uncle, Mr. Morton Pitt, and her aunt, with whom she lived, first at Arlington Street and then at Barham Court. This introduces us to an amusing incident which happened at Barham Court, to Dr. Johnson, and which we have not found recorded elsewhere. "The doctor, who was a frequent and welcome visitor at her aunt's house, was once groping his way downstairs in the middle of the night to get a small carpet-bag, containing some precious manuscript, which he remembered leaving on a chair at the foot of the stairs. During his progress he placed his hand on the banisters, and felt what he thought to be the head of a man ! Supposing it to be the head of a housebreaker, he seized it, and roared with all his might. When the affrighted household had assembled, candle in hand, the robber turned out to be an old lady's wig, which her maid had left by mistake on one of the large round knobs of the carved oak staircase."

Being thus brought up, almost from a child, amongst grown-up persons, her "coming out," as it was called, at the age of seventeen, made but slight difference to her. She had lived, as she says, as much in the world before as she did afterwards.

At the end of her first season, she was married to Sir William Chatterton, with whom she lived till his death in 1855. Here we have the main portion of her life, and her diary is full of interesting experiences of most of the distinguished literary characters of the day, whom she met either in the social circles of Seymour Place, Holland House, Devonshire House, or in the foreign capitals during her occasional journeys abroad. In looking through this period of her memoirs, we meet with the names of Rogers, Chantrey, Dean Milman, Moore, Wordsworth, Miss Sedgwick, Sydney Smith, Johanna Bailey, Miss Somerville ; in a word, all the literary names which, during that brilliant period, constituted what was rightly termed *society*. To "stink o' brass" did not then give the entrée to houses where men and women met who had something to say, and knew how to say it.

A quaint and amusing anecdote is here related of Miss Sedgwick, the American. "She had been rather puzzled at the London hours, and having begun her intercourse with literary society at the breakfasts given by Rogers, Kenyon, Sydney Smith, &c., she fancied that the English had their chief meal in the morning. But yesterday she was undeceived, for Mrs. M.—had asked her to come to a party at her house, without saying the hour. So Miss Sedgwick asked what time she was to come. "Oh, come early, quite early, and we shall have a little

pleasant talk before the others come. I expect a very large party—so come before nine—come at eight o'clock." "Well," thought Miss Sedgwick, the English evidently *are* early risers, to have a large party at such an hour." So she got up rather earlier than usual yesterday morning, and after dressing with more than usual care, arrived at Mrs. M——'s house punctually at eight in the morning. She found a housemaid coming out of the door to wash the steps, and after awhile a footman appeared struggling into his coat, and looking at the carriage with evident consternation. Is this Mrs. M——'s house, and does she expect a party so early to breakfast? "No ma'am," he replied, "there's no party to breakfast; it is this evening that a large party is expected." "I did not like to betray my ignorance and stupidity," said Miss Sedgwick, "so I drove home and went there at eight in the evening. I confessed my stupid mistake to Mrs. M——, and we had a merry laugh about it."

We have also here two charming ghost stories and some singular cases of second sight, both approaching more nearly to the authentic than most narratives of the kind. They will all bear perusal, and give a life and lightness to this portion of the book. The history of the Raynham ghost is well told, but we are rather disappointed that so admirable a teller of ghost stories, and one confessedly so much "en rapport" with the spiritual world, has not left us a word on the Baddesley ghost! Of all places where ghosts may be supposed to delight to dwell, we cannot imagine a more charming ghostly *habitat* than the quaint weird old edifice of Baddesley Clinton. Shut out from the world by its wide moat, overhung by dark and venerable trees, you enter the courtyard by a massive gate, which may well have opened to receive the heroes from Crescy or Poitiers. But we are here only

Vestibulum ante ipsum, primisque in faucibus orci.

The house itself in which the writer of the memoirs passed the latter portion of her life possesses, and deservedly so, a "Peculiar," whose rare presence, from time to time verified, might form an interesting editorial note to a new edition of the "Memoirs."

But to return to the work itself: We have also here incidental mention of numerous literary productions of Lady Chatterton. Translations, travels, novels, poetry, so varied, various, and multiplied, amounting in all to twenty-seven different works, that, as we remember her delicate form and features, and the incessant demands made upon her by her position and duties to society, we are amazed

"That one small head could carry all she knew."

What may be termed the second period of her life begins with her marriage with Mr. Edward Heneage Dering, in 1859, and her residence at Finchden, Wootton Hall, and Baddesley Clinton, in Warwickshire, where she died in 1876.

This portion but incidentally mentions her continued literary labours, but is mainly taken up with her mental struggles to find and grasp the

truths of religion, in which she was assisted by her husband, a recent convert, but mainly guided and enlightened by the marvellous letters of the Bishop of Birmingham, with whom she opened a correspondence on her spiritual difficulties, which continued till her happy reception into the bosom of the Catholic Church.

It has been remarked, and to a superficial reader there would seem but little connection between the two parts of the "Memoirs" we have indicated; but, in reality, they are intimately and essentially connected, even so far as to form, in a sense, cause and effect.

Her mind was pre-eminently a spiritual mind; this makes itself visible repeatedly in her diary. From youth upwards there was a grave earnestness, mingled with the brightness of a child, and a deep love and longing for reality and truth in all things. Her mind was essentially a truthful one, and a sham, whether in manner, dress, society, speech, even down to the materials of a house or a piece of furniture, was intrinsically abhorrent to her. Her habits and instincts were thus essentially Catholic, and only when she had found, after long years, all that she sought for, within the pale of the Church, did she truly and really find rest. She had cast her bread upon the waters, and it had come back to her after many days. In this lifelong quality of truthfulness we have the key to her character. We see how she was gradually led from her youth upwards towards the Church; how it was that, though herself not a Catholic, she aided so many in that direction, by encouraging in them purity of life and correspondence with the Divine light given them; how so many following this light were forced to look back in sorrow upon their guide, still pointing the way, but outstripped in the race, and to solace themselves only in prayer.

We see this especially in the letters she, from time to time, wrote to the Bishop of Birmingham, explaining her difficulties, and his loving and learned replies to her, as well as his sage advice to others, "Not to hurry her." We may hope and believe, then, that during all these long years she was waiting God's time, and remained where she was in good faith, lest by following what she imagined an inferior motive, she should be acting untruthfully towards the Divine light. We can also thus reconcile that apparent contradiction in her conduct and her letters, viz., remaining so long outside the Church, and when the light came, and she followed it, wondering that all did not see what now appeared so plain to her.

In this manner one obstacle after another was securely and happily removed. And these were not few or trivial; for the letters of the Bishop, reproduced in the memoirs, comprise valuable treatises, brief—but to the point—on the Holy Eucharist, on Faith, on the Education and Celibacy of the Clergy, on the Rosary, the Immaculate Conception, on Ceremonial, &c. These represent so many points gained in her gradual advance, so many difficulties removed. And still as she ascended, new heights rose before her, presenting fresh obstacles, requiring fresh lights and graces.

One wonderful letter from the Bishop on feeling and will, or the perfect compatibility of Human love with Divine, love seems to have been

called for by one of the last temptations she had to overcome,—the greater, because it had its rise in a desire to avoid whatever might appear to take away from the *perfect* offering of her heart to Almighty God.

And then the last letter she received, and which was so great a consolation to her,—on the theory of Humility, springing from a *true* knowledge of self, and of God's merciful dealings with us. As a builder, who has to raise a goodly tower, lays the stones, rough hewn, perhaps, course after course, till he has placed the last one on the summit, and then gradually descends, polishing, finishing, improving stage by stage, till he finds himself once more at the foundation—and then, and then alone, does he feel the satisfaction that his work is done.

"A short month after the receipt of the last letter," in the words of the Memoir, "her beautiful soul passed away—

A guisa d'un soave e chiaro lume
Cui nutrimento a poco a poco manca."

We cannot describe the final scene better than in the simply beautiful words of Mr. Ferrers: "The day was beautiful for the funeral, one emblematic of the departed; for nature refused to put on mourning, as though it said, 'lament not for one in bliss.' Every twig and blade of grass was robed in white, and glistened in the sunshine; the fir-trees were one mass of frosted silver, and only slight tints of their dark-green foliage were visible to distinguish them from other trees. Nature seemed not to mourn, but to put on its best attire, and though we all did indeed deeply mourn, we had a peaceful joy respecting her happiness, which is our consolation now."

In taking leave of this most interesting and useful volume, we must heartily thank Mr. Dering for this very important addition to our Catholic literature. The story of her life will make Georgiana, Lady Chatterton, still live, and still carry out the great object of her life—that of doing good to others. Her case, so well drawn out in this volume, is, *mutatis mutandis*, the case with so many cultivated minds in these days, a life of desire to know the truth that will satisfy; and from these memoirs we may gather consolation and hope—consolation in the thought that we can never do anything for God which will not sooner or later bring its reward; and hope that, though this reward may not come at once, or just when we wish it, God's time is best, though it may be the eleventh hour. In the words of the Bishop, standing at the grave: "Her whole life had been a long preparation for the reception of the truth," and he compared her to "the exquisite and delicate flower that blooms but once in a hundred years, bursts into perfection in a single night, and is gone."

We would also record our thanks to Mr. Dering himself, who, not consulting his own feelings, has drawn for us instruction from still open wounds, and forgot his own pain in our profit; and yet we may hope not without a melancholy pleasure in the work, for—

"Praising what is lost
Makes the remembrance dear."

We think we may without flattery say, that the "added tomb," with

its cross of pure white marble, and the fair fresh flowers blooming on the recent grave, have found their appropriate completion in the volume before us, and that the story of the life of Lady Chatterton will long be read, and will serve as a light and a beacon to guide many others into the same port of rest.

"Heaven doth with us, as we with torches do :
Not light them for themselves : for if our virtues
Did not go forth of us, 'twere all as like
As if we had them not."

Practical Hints on the Education of the Sons of Gentlemen. By an Educator.
London : Burns & Oates.

WE heartily commend this pamphlet to the study of those engaged in education. It treats exclusively of secular intellectual training, and abounds with shrewd and very serviceable remarks on that theme. The author is apparently one of those whom he himself designates as "grinders"; and his experience invests his dicta with a special significance of their own. It is true that a large tinge of half-humorous and (we doubt not) intentional exaggeration pervades the whole pamphlet; but we think that this rather adds spice and point to the author's remarks, than importantly detracts from their value.

For instance, the following comment on "idlers" contains surely a large amount of truth, and of truth which it behoves educators to bear in mind.

"We have some knowledge of these so-called idlers. . . . We believe a grave moral wrong is done them. . . . Boys in a strong healthful state are not idle, and in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the fault is in the teacher, and not in the pupil" (p. 8).

It is not, however, only on this particular subject, but in general, that we do not hesitate to express substantial agreement with a large proportion of the "Educator's" views, though of course we are far from yielding universal and unreserved assent to his pamphlet. And there is one particular in it to which we would draw especial attention. We mentioned in our last number that, whereas large improvements in English Catholic college education are abundantly possible and urgently needed, it is not, nevertheless, existing Protestant institutions which Catholics will wisely regard as models. So in substance the present writer.

"We will not enter [he says] very minutely into the system of education pursued in our Catholic colleges. We believe that on examination it will not be found to differ very much from that which is followed in most of the Protestant public schools, and even at the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, so far at least as the secular portion of the training is concerned" (p. 21).

Then (p. 43) he accounts it (and so do we) as a matter of prominent importance, that youths be carefully trained in the English language. He points out that the London University is the only university that re-

cognizes this ; adding, of course, that the London University is not a teaching body at all. "None of the teaching bodies," he says—Protestant any more than Catholic—"has done as yet anything worthy of notice to encourage the study of the language of Shakspeare, Milton, Bacon, and Locke."

We conclude our extracts with the author's own concluding paragraph. It contains, as will be seen, a vigorous onslaught on the masters of Protestant schools in general. We may add, however, that the last two sentences show how far is our "Educator" himself from having acquired the habit of always speaking in very clear and intelligible English.

"These men are slow to learn. Not long ago they condemned, as barbarous and contrary to the usage of the rest of Europe, the English pronunciation of Latin ; and yet most of them will not spend a few hours in what their reason tells them is the more correct mode of pronouncing it. If you hint at the advisability of their learning to read with fluency, emphasis, and expression, they will feel insulted, and think you irreverent if you chance to nod during their drawling monotonous sermons. They are not the men who change. If gentlemen have to wait till they [these Protestant masters] fit themselves for giving their sons [the sons of the aforesaid gentlemen] a sound English education, they [the gentlemen] will have to wait a long time. For some years to come these gentlemen [not those who were called 'gentlemen' in the previous sentence, but Protestant masters] will continue their attempts to build huge temples to the muses, without ever thinking that they have no better foundation for these grand edifices than the shifting sand" (p. 47).

The Church and the Gentile World at the First Promulgation of the Gospel
—Considerations on the Catholicity of the Church soon after her Birth. By the Rev. AUG. J. THÉBAUD, S.J. Two volumes and Atlas. London : Burns, Oates, & Co. ; New York : Collier. 1878.

F. THÉBAUD'S well-known work on Gentilism has won him a high place in the ranks of contemporary Catholic literature, and we gladly welcome another important work from the same pen. To attempt to criticise within the narrow limits of a notice these two learned volumes and the atlas which illustrates them would be presumptuous on our part. They display the fruits of painstaking research over an enormous field, and must have cost their author years of conscientious labour. They tell how Christianity won its way in the ancient world ; they trace its course not only within the limits of the Roman Empire, but also beyond them, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. They show how rapidly the Church vindicated her claim to the title of universal ; and by setting forth the overwhelming difficulties she had to conquer, they prove that her victory was a supernatural one. Without sacrificing its unity of plan, the book contains a mass of details.

Social Aspects of Catholicism and Protestantism, in their Civil Bearing upon Nations. Translated and adapted from the French of M. le Baron de Haulleville, by HENRY BELLINGHAM, M.A., Barrister-at-Law; with a Preface by His Eminence Cardinal MANNING. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1878.

WE gladly echo Cardinal Manning's words to the effect that "it is a sign of happy augury when we see laymen like Mr. Bellingham and the Baron de Haulleville devoting their intelligence and their industry to the refutation of the great deceit" that Catholicity is an obstacle to civilization, prosperity, and true progress. Last October we reviewed at some length M. de Haulleville's excellent work "*De l'Avenir des Peuples Catholiques*," and we have now little to add to the praise we then gave it. We can only welcome it in its English dress, at the same time taking note of the fact that Mr. Bellingham has done much more than merely translate it: he has produced what is in great part a new work, making many valuable and thoughtful additions to the original array of facts and arguments. It is now a complete *vade mecum* of the subject, one with which every Catholic should be familiar, as false assertions as to the influence of Catholicity and Protestantism on national prosperity are continually to be met with in the press, on the platform, and in conversation with non-Catholics. When such assertions are made, it is a duty to be able to answer them, and the ready answer is always to be found in Mr. Bellingham's pages. We hope to see the work ere long in a second edition, and we may with a view to this suggest a revision which would remove such little blemishes as M. de Haulleville's statement (p. 23) that the English never talk of "progress"; and the classical names printed in their French form at pages 70 and 71. At page 291 the Registrar-General's returns might be substituted for Dr. Forbes's, as they are both more telling and more authoritative, and finally an index would add greatly to the value of the book as a work of reference, for which it is well fitted and will doubtless be largely used. It should be in the hands of every Catholic who, writes, or has occasion to speak in public, and in those of every one who enters the society of educated Protestants or non-Catholics.

Epitaphs of the Catacombs; or, Christian Inscriptions in Rome during the first Four Centuries. By REV. J. SPENCER NORTHCOTE, D.D. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1878.

PURSUING his plan of making popular and placing within reach of all, the work which De Rossi does for the learned and those who would deeply study the subject, Dr. Northcote gives us another volume, this time dealing only with the "*Epitaphs of the Catacombs*." From its very title, such a book is attractive, but all high expectations derived from

the title are justified, and far more than justified, in this small volume. After giving us a good substratum of general knowledge about Christian epigraphy and its remains, the author goes into the subject of Pagan epitaphs, that in the next chapter the strong contrast may be shown between them and those of Christians. Then follow three most interesting chapters, entitled "Dogmatic Allusions," "Their Testimony to certain Points of Discipline and Practice," and "Their Moral and Social Aspect"; and before the "Conclusion" a chapter is devoted to "Inscriptions with Symbols." The book is crowded with illustrations, giving fac-similes of the epitaphs as they appear, and it is but little to say that the author's style is fascinating in carrying us from one phase of his subject to another. Nor would we do him justice by saying that he popularizes De Rossi; for this would be leaving out of account his own criticism and research in other quarters, and before the publication of De Rossi's volumes covering the same ground. We are glad to see that a new edition of "*Roma Sotteranea*" is about to appear. The subject is one of undying interest, and the same interest ought to attach to those books, now that the discoveries in the catacombs have been classified and their history proved, while for further discovery and for criticism so wide a field is yet left.

Unravell'd Convictions; or, My Road to Faith. By a Convert.
Burns & Oates. 1878.

THIS pamphlet, which we last year saw first in a printed but still unpublished form, is without doubt the most remarkable exposition made of the various steps to complete belief since the world-known "*Apologia*." Ten years since, in November, 1868, the gradual unravelling, which it describes, was completed by the crowning conviction that submission to the Catholic Church was necessary, though the final act was delayed yet four years. And it is only now, after the intervening years of practical discipleship and the modesty of silence, that the author has consented to allow the public to share in the experience then gained, and the travail of soul undergone. The grounds of conviction to faith are treated in their usual order, though in an unusual and original manner.

1. The necessity of a Rule of Faith, and the insufficiency of all but the Catholic Rule.
2. The spirit of Holy Writ, together with certain distinct passages found in it.
3. The writings of the Early Fathers.
4. The History of the Church.

Not being possessed of any religious form of belief, or obeying any teaching but that of a remarkably clear moral sense, which was evidently listened to and followed, the author was obliged to work upward from the very groundwork; and it is amazing with what clearness the steps towards the true path were sought out and, as it were, quested in the dark, and faithfully followed to the goal. Even

where this has elsewhere been done, it has not been given to many accurately to reckon up and number these steps for the teaching of others, especially in the calm, gradual, crystal-clear manner of these "Convictions." With consummate patience, persistence, and delicate skill, the thread is held in hand throughout, and without a single tangle or break the web of spiritual progress is unravelled to the last strand. As an intellectual effort alone, the book is a valuable study, while it is still more remarkable as an exposition of character. For it is a personal experience—always difficult to manage—in which the heart, mind, feelings, workings of the will and spiritual history are laid open to view just as the mechanism of a clock is exposed under a glass case—yet, although this is done with the intimate minuteness of dissection, there is not a trace of egotism, a vestige of self-consciousness, or the faintest flavour of self-occupation throughout the hundred and twenty-five closely-printed pages. It is impossible that this publication should not open many eyes to the true road to the only real Faith.

The Freedom of Science in the Modern State. By RUDOLF VIRCHOW, Professor in the University, and Member of the Academy of Sciences of Berlin; Member of the Prussian House of Deputies. Translated from the German, and revised by the Author. London: John Murray, Albemarle Street. 1878.

THIS discourse was delivered by Dr. Virchow last September, at the annual meeting of German Naturalists and Physicians, an assembly analogous to our own British Association. Two addresses had previously been read, one by Professor Haeckel, "On the Modern Theory of Evolution in its relation to Science in general," and the other by Professor Nägeli, "On the Limits of Knowledge in Natural Science." In these the theory of evolution was applied, and that not as hypothesis, but as doctrine, not only to the bodies of animals, including man, but to mind, which was explained in a materialistic sense; and it was further contended that the theory as thus expounded ought to be taught in schools. These inconsiderate and boyish statements drew forth Dr. Virchow's discourse, in which he called the attention of his hearers to some of the weak points of the evolution theory, claimed that it should be treated as an hypothesis, and expressed his opinion that the setting forth of such extreme views as those which had been brought before the meeting by Nägeli and Haeckel was not unlikely to result in scientific men being regarded, and treated, as enemies of civil society. His remarks have the greater weight that he is by no means a "champion of orthodoxy." In his preface to the English translation, he tells us that although nothing was further from his intention than any wish to disparage the great services rendered by Mr. Darwin to the advancement of biological science, it nevertheless

"Seemed to him high time to utter an energetic protest against the attempts that are made to proclaim the problems of research as actual facts, the opinions of scientists as established science, and thereby to set

in a false light before the eyes of the less-informed masses, not merely the methods of science, but also its whole position in regard to the intellectual life of men and nations.

"With a few individual exceptions, this protest has met with cordial assent from German naturalists. They feel themselves set free again from the tyranny of dogmatism. They have regained the certainty that, in Natural Science as in all else, real work, even if it produces only isolated results, is a better security for the durability of progress than the most ingenious speculation. Let us hope that men of science in England also will not fail to examine this most serious question, whether the authority of science will not be better secured, if it confines itself strictly to its own province, than if it undertakes to master the whole view of nature by the premature generalising of theoretical combinations" (pp. vi., vii.).

As to the hypothesis of a simian descent for man, after reminding his hearers that human bones have been found in quaternary, but not, as yet, in tertiary strata, he says:—

"In our days the quaternary man is a fact universally accepted . . . the tertiary man, on the contrary, is a problem, the material evidence of which is now under discussion. . . . Eminent churchmen even, such as the Abbé Bourgeois, are convinced that man lived in the tertiary period. . . . Let us keep provisionally to the quaternary man, whom we really find. When we study this fossil man of the quaternary period, who must, of course, have stood comparatively near to our primitive ancestors in order of descent, or rather of ascent, we always find a *man*, just such as men are now.

"As recently as ten years ago, whenever a skull was found in a peat bog, or in pile-dwellings, or in ancient caves, people fancied they saw in it a wonderful token of an inferior state, still quite undeveloped. They smelt out the very scent of the ape: only this has continually been more and more lost. The old troglodytes, pile-villagers, and bog-people, prove to be quite a respectable society. They have heads so large, that many a living person would be only too happy to possess such. Our French neighbours, indeed, have warned us against inferring too much from these big heads. It may have been that their contents were not merely nerve-substance, but that the ancient brains may have had more interstitial tissue than is now usual, and that, in spite of the size of the brain, their nerve-substance may have remained at a lower stage of development. This, however, is but the sort of familiar talk which is brought in as a kind of prop for weak minds. . . . Every addition to the amount of objects, which we have obtained as materials for discussion, has removed us further from the hypothesis propounded. At the same time we cannot entirely set aside the consideration, that the men of the tertiary period may perhaps have lived only on a particular part of the earth, and will still be brought to light somewhere or other out of the depths. Only, as a matter of fact, we must positively recognize that there still exists as yet a sharp line of demarcation between man and the ape. WE CANNOT TEACH, WE CANNOT PRONOUNCE IT TO BE A CONQUEST OF SCIENCE, THAT MAN DESCENDS FROM THE APE, OR FROM ANY OTHER ANIMAL. We can only indicate it as an hypothesis, however probable it may seem, and however obvious a solution it may appear" (pp. 58-63).

In a precisely similar spirit Dr. Virchow discusses spontaneous generation. That doctrine is, he says, in harmony with the tendency to generalization which has found its place in the speculations of various nations and races up to the most venerable antiquity. Especially in con-

nection with evolutionism, "there is something soothing" in being able to say that the living at some time originated from the non-living. "But in opposition to all this it must be emphatically stated that all really scientific knowledge respecting the beginning of life has followed a course exactly contrary" (p. 36). Much in the same way, while fully taking account of the fact that "few naturalists now refuse to admit the opinion that man stands in some sort of connection with the rest of the animal kingdom," "I am bound," he subjoins, "to declare that every positive advance which we have made in the province of pre-historic archæology has actually removed us further from the proof of such a connection" (p. 58).

Indefinitely more important than any biological discussion as to the immediate origin of man's body is the question of the source and nature of his mind. As to this, Nægeli had asserted all matter to be alive; and the same opinion is held by Haeckel.* Originating in the fetichism common in extremely barbarous races, continued by the old pagan anthropomorphism and deification of the forces of nature, introduced into philosophy at the most early period of its history, and carried on in Hylozoism and the mystical speculations of the Platonists, it was not unnatural that this primæval fancy should find a home in the "systems" of Schelling, Hegel, Schopenhauer, and Hartmann, especially when we take into the account the impetus which must have been given to it by the Unconscious Mental Modifications of Leibnitz and the Reflex Action of the Physiologists. "The stupendous assumption," as the authors of the "*Unseen Universe*" call it, "that visible matter is alive" and unconsciously thinks and wills, seems to bridge over the gulph between the living and the non-living, the conscious and the unconscious; it renders it possible to give some kind of account of the design in nature; and thus, though no more than a poetical

* "By the Theory of Descent we are for the first time enabled to conceive of the unity of nature in such a manner that a mechanico-causal explanation of even the most intricate organic phenomena, for example, the origin and structure of the organs of sense, is no more difficult (in a general way) than is the mechanical explanation of any physical process; as, for example, earthquakes, the courses of the wind, or the currents of the ocean. We thus arrive at the extremely important conviction that *all natural bodies* which are known to us are *equally animated*, that the distinction which has been made between animate and inanimate bodies does *not* exist. When a stone is thrown into the air, and falls to earth according to definite laws, or when in a solution of salt a crystal is formed, the phenomenon is neither more nor less a manifestation of life than the growth and flowering of plants, than the propagation of animals or the activity of their senses, than the perception or the formation of thought in man."—"History of Creation," vol. i. p. 23, English edition). The retention of this relic of Hegelianism by Professor Haeckel made it not inappropriate to prefix to the English translation of his book the passage from Wordsworth, speaking of

"A motion and a spirit that impels
All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
And rolls through all things."

imagination, it is so exceedingly useful to the antitheistic naturalistic school that no one need be surprised to find them recurring in other language to the dreams of savage man, and to the Love and Desire and Strife of Heraclitus and Empedocles. So powerful a hold has it over the imagination that it even coloured and tinged the later speculations of M. Comte, although in his earlier writings he was a determined opponent of the fetichistic spirit, and it is not, therefore, by any means extraordinary that we should find scientists playing with it even in our own country, where it is usually supposed that common sense in speculation is more widely diffused than in Germany.

We conclude by laying before our readers Dr. Virchow's remarks on Hylozoism; as will be perceived, they are in the direction which the facts warrant, but fail by not going sufficiently far.

"We cannot say to every peasant child, 'This is actual, this is known; and that is only supposed.' On the contrary, what we know and what we only suppose blend themselves, as a general rule, so completely into a single picture, that what is supposed appears to be the principal thing, and what is known seems the accessory. So much the more is it incumbent on us who profess science, whose lives are spent in science, to refrain from putting our mere suppositions into the heads of men, and—I would say here with special emphasis—into the heads of the teachers of schools. . . . This is the complaint which I have to make against, for example, Dr. Nægeli. He certainly discussed the difficult questions which he chose for his subject with the greatest moderation, and—as you will see when you read his discourse—in a thoroughly philosophic spirit. Nevertheless, he took a step which I consider most dangerous. In fact, what the *generatio æquivoca* does, he has done in another direction. He demands that the province of mind should not only be extended from animals to plants, but that we should finally pass over from the organic to the inorganic world with our conceptions of the nature of mental operations.

"This mode of thinking, which has its representatives among great philosophers, is in itself very natural. If any one insists on bringing the operations of the mind into connection with the other processes of the universe, he is of necessity led, in the first place, to extend the psychical phenomena, which are observed in man and in the most highly organized vertebrate animals, to the lower and ever lower forms of animal life; next, the plants also obtain their soul; further, the cell is endowed with sensation and thought; and finally, the transition is made to the chemical atoms, which hate or love, seek or fly from one another.

"This is all very fine and admirable, and may ultimately, perhaps, prove true. It is *possible*. But in the mean time, have we really any need?—are we bound by any positive scientific necessity?—to extend the province of mental operations beyond those bodies in which, and in connection with which, they are actually exhibited? I have no objection to your saying that atoms of carbon also possess mind, or that in their connection with the Plastidule company they acquire mind; only I *do not know how I am to perceive this*. It is a mere playing with words. If I explain attraction and repulsion as exhibitions of mind, as psychical phenomena, I simply throw the Psyche out of window, and the Psyche ceases to be Psyche.

"The processes of the human mind may ultimately find a chemical explanation, but at present, in my opinion, it is not our business to bring these provinces into connection. Much rather is it our business to keep

them strictly to the limits within which we actually perceive them. And as I have all along laid stress upon this—that we should not seek in the first place the *transition* of the inorganic, but rather first fix the *contrast* between the inorganic and the organic, and direct our studies to this contrast,—so do I also maintain that this is the only way of progress ; and I have the firmest conviction that we shall make no advance, unless we fix the province of mental processes at those limits within which mental phenomena actually present themselves to us, and unless we refrain from *supposing* mental phenomena where they may indeed *possibly* take place, but where we perceive no *visible, audible, tangible*, in a word, no *sensible* phenomena, which could be designated as intellectual. . . . And I must enter my decided protest against the attempt to make a premature extension of our doctrines in this manner, and to be ever thrusting into the very foreground of our expositions that which has so often proved an insoluble problem” (pp. 50-55).

The familiarity of those among our readers who take an interest in these matters with the arguments drawn from the specific nature of all mental phenomena, the inextendedness of the higher mental phenomena, the persistency of the *Ego*, and the like, and the ease with which some at least of these arguments may be found in Manuals of Catholic Philosophy, render it unnecessary for us to append to the above passage any corrections of our own.

The Novena of Grace Revealed by Saint Francis Xavier to Father Mastrilli, of the Society of Jesus. Dublin: M. H. GILL & Son, 50, Upper Sackville Street. 1878.

THE “Novena of Grace” is a Novena in honour of St. Francis Xavier, specially commemorative of the fact of his Canonization. It is called the “Novena of Grace,” on account of the many striking favours with which Heaven has blessed it. St. Francis revealed it to Father Mastrilli, a holy Jesuit, who died for the Faith in Japan, during a dangerous illness which St. Francis miraculously cured. “Before the apparition ceased, the Saint gave him in a most tender way several counsels for his perfection, and assured him that all who would earnestly ask his intercession with God for nine days, in honour of his Canonization, would infallibly experience the effects of his great power in heaven, and would receive whatever they asked that would contribute to their salvation” (p. 16).

The Novena became well known in Spain, Portugal, France, the Low Countries, Poland, Germany, and Italy. “No form of prayer is regularly prescribed, though there are certain prayers which are venerable from their authorship, and sanctioned by long use in the Novena” (p. 37). These prayers, and a short practical meditation for each day of the Novena, are to be found at the end of the above-named book, which has the “Nihil Obstat” of the distinguished Jesuit Father O'Reilly, and the “Imprimatur” of his Eminence Cardinal Cullen.

We think this little book calculated to spread solid devotion to St.

Francis, and therefore we particularly recommend it to our readers ; for assuredly English Catholics ought to be specially mindful of the "Apostle of the Indies." During this great war the minds of Englishmen have been centred on India. Whilst so anxious to save it from the grasp of schismatic Russia, have English Catholics been equally solicitous for its true spiritual welfare? Millions of souls in that far-off land are in no small degree dependent on us for the blessings of true faith, and in what manner are we looking the fact in the face? Our responsibility is well nigh appalling. Might not the "Novena of Grace" be occasionally used publicly for reminding us of our duty towards our Indian fellow-subjects? May the recollection of the zeal of St. Francis quicken our own! May the memory of his life and labours in the East teach us our duties there, and may his intercession help us to fulfil them!

The Suppliant of the Holy Ghost. A Paraphrase of the Veni Sancte Spiritus. Now first printed from a manuscript of the seventeenth century, composed by the Rev. RICHARD JOHNSON, &c. &c. Edited by Rev. T. E. Bridgett, C.S.S.R. Burns & Oates. 1878.

WE are always glad to receive anything from F. Bridgett's hands, but in the present case we owe him more than our usual warmth of thanks for his Whitsuntide volume. He justly tells us that in discovering the manuscript of the *Vox Fletus et Vox Clamoris* of the seventeenth century, he had lighted on a treasure of no common price ; and it is only wonderful that the long succession of excellent priests, so remarkable for their eminent good works in the parish of St. Nicholas, Liverpool, should not have heretofore given this beautiful devotional book to the public. It is more than a paraphrase of the Sequence ; for it branches out, in the simplest and yet the most fervent language, into a series of contemplations on each line or article of the unequalled prayer, which can scarcely fail to kindle the coldest or driest soul. These contemplations, also, follow so easily, we had almost said naturally, the leading idea in each branch of the Sequence, and embody so aptly, as they flow, the Scriptural allusions bearing upon it, that they seem rather to be the outflow of the heart than a studied composition for devotional use. Instances in point might be taken at random :—

"Come, Holy Ghost ; come in tongues unto me, but in fiery tongues ; touch mine so efficaciously that I may never more abuse it in vanity, in lying and detraction. Truth tells us, who offends not in his tongue is a perfect man. I am far from perfection, and therefore far from an innocent, far from an unoffending tongue. Come, therefore, purge my tongue from all that is amiss ; come, quicken it, that it may never cease to praise and glorify Thy name. Come and instruct it, that it may learn to teach Thy truth to others : *ut vitam habeant, et abundantius habeant*—'that they may have life, and have it more abundantly.'—John x. 10."

Besides these contemplations, which are calculated to deepen and enlarge the reverential devotion towards the Third Person of the blessed Trinity,

the volume contains some excellent meditations on Holy Communion, and a paraphrase on the Lord's Prayer, full of doctrine and earnest devotional suggestion.

Emmanuel: a Book of Eucharistic Verses. By the Rev. MATHEW RUSSELL, S.J. Dublin: Gill & Son. 1878.

IF this is F. Russell's first publication in verse, we can only say that we bid him God speed, and hope that he will soon give us some more volumes to criticise. There is a great want of sacred songs, hymns, and verses among us, especially such as might popularize and endear religious subjects and acts to children. We sincerely hope that F. Russell will turn his attention to this subject, and add something to our store. His "Praise to the Blessed Sacrament" is full of beauty; and if set to some stirring, irregular melody, would be most attractive to a congregation. The next prayer, "Veni, Jesu," for "Before Communion," though not so marked with originality, is very sweet and pure. The "Petitions of St. Augustine" are exceedingly well rendered; and the "Ejaculations for Vacant Moments" are admirable suggestions for pious thoughts, which we hope many will commit to memory and frequently use to their profit.

A Lytel Boke for ye Maryemonth, compiled and adapted for the use of Our Blessed Ladye's Sodalists and other Liegemen of her Dower, as England is called; by a former Prefect of the Sodality at Stonyhurst College. London: Burns & Oates. 1878.

AS the Faith spreads and gains ground in England, more and more it shows its rich fruit of devotion to Mary, and the fruit becomes its further seed. In 1849 the only statue of Our Blessed Lady in a public church in London was at St. Mary's, Chelsea. What a contrast to the good old times when the land was star-strewn with her shrines! The *Lytel Boke* is meant to commemorate that "good old time"; to bring back its spirit; and to reverence, at least by name, these old places of devotion. In its pages we hear of prayer to Our Ladye of Grace at the Pillar in St. Paul's Cathedral; Our Ladye of Newenham, Cambridge, where Simon Stock in vision before dawn was taught the devotion of the scapular; Our Ladye of Oxford, before whose image St. Edmund of Abingdon espoused himself with a ring of gold engraved with the angelic salutation, and the image was long venerated by the university. There is a sadness in these days about the strangeness of some of these titles—Our Ladye of Willesden, "venerated for many centuries," and Our Ladye at the Oak, Islington. The devotions given here for the daily use of students have the four necessary qualities of all spiritual exercises for the young; they are very short and simple, and at the same time varied and thoroughly practical. The value of the little work is told by the fact that it comes from the hand of a former Prefect of the Sodality at Stonyhurst College, and is preceded by a letter of commendation from the present rector.

The True Love of God, and other Devotions of Divine Love. By the Rev. JAMES A. MALTUS, O.S.D., London: Burns & Oates. 1878.

PRAYERS dwelling upon the motives that excite a love of God are followed by acts of love to be repeated again and again while the mind dwells upon the reflections that have arisen from the preceding prayer. This is the plan of most of the book, the long chain of motives of love being carried through devotion to the Blessed Sacrament and to the Sacred Heart; while the last part, "The Refuge of Mary," the refrain of the Litany of Loreto is the ejaculation to be repeated. The part called "The love of Jesus in the adorable sacrifice of the Mass" ought to be to many a help in meditation and in preparing for communion. We trust the author will through this little work reap abundantly the fruit of his prayer to move souls to divine love before life ends.

May Papers; or Thoughts on the Litany of Loreto. By EDWARD IGNATIUS PURBRICK, Priest of the Society of Jesus. Second edition. London: Burns & Oates. 1878.

"THESE papers," says the author in the preface, "were written for the use of the boys at Stonyhurst College during the month of May. They were suggested by the difficulty of finding any short lessons for the month addressed directly and especially to boys. They are now published in the hope that they may be found useful in other colleges and schools."

After exhorting the students in the school of Mary to bring to her feet at the beginning of the month two things—*teachableness* and *a definite aim*—the author takes daily a title of the litany to expound. Of course, the great value of these May papers must arise, not only from the admirable thoughts elicited by each title, but from the special reference that is constantly made to students and to their work at school as a preparation for after-life. He has in his mind a thought of their studies, when he bids them notice that "Mary's aid gives no countenance to sloth or cowardice. She does not come, like one of Homer's goddesses, to hide her favourite in a cloud, and take him in unseen flight far away from the battle-field. She likes to see the blood and dust of the struggle upon our limbs. She shields us indeed, but she 'teaches our hands to war and our fingers to fight.' " He has before him the boyish need of playground and games, while he is showing the attractions of spiritual joy:—"But you will say, are we never to enjoy ourselves in anything else but what is directly pious and holy? No such thing. All things are good in their place. Recreation, fun, mirth, are sunshine, and a sort of sunshine which is quite as necessary in proper time and place for the health of your souls as for that of your bodies. Gloom and sadness have no place in the Catholic system of training; for gloom and sadness are only less evils than sin itself. But then good things may be abused. Evil is always walking in the shadow of

good." Amongst the many May books there is none that will be a more useful guide than this to the young still in their schooldays ; for it contains a mass of attractive instruction and persuasive counsel, given, little by little, by one whose heart warms both to his subject and to his hearers.

A Life of Pope Pius IX. By JOHN R. G. HASSARD. Catholic Publication Society. New York : 1878.

MR. HASSARD justly observes, that the Pontificate of Pius IX. contains materials for a volume of almost any length (being, in fact, a full quarter of a century of battles), but that a short account, recapitulating the principal events, but rather presenting a portrait of the chief actor than a quantity of details, will be acceptable to many Catholic readers. Probably there is no Pope on record, about whom so many romantic fictions have been forged and spread. Mr. Adolphus Trollope, being a writer of fiction by profession, may, perhaps, be forgiven for investing the young Count Mastai's life with the usual incidents of sensational novels ; but other writers have taken up the cry, and continued the traditions of sentiment and romantic contrast. Mr. Trollope has it that the Count, having been attached in his youth to a beautiful girl, and finding that the current of his love did not run smooth, he turned his thoughts to the priesthood. It was also a common opinion that he had chosen the military profession as his career, and was a candidate for the Pope's Noble Guard, but, being afflicted with fits, resolved to offer himself to the priesthood. The fact was, that the first Napoleon had sought to embody a guard for his own person of the noblest-born young men in Italy, and, without his knowledge, Count Mastai's name was enrolled with the rest on the list. Having already, and very early, made choice of the priesthood, with God's grace, as his career, the Count struck out his name as soon as he knew that it was on the Emperor's list. While he was still studying in Rome, almost a boy, with his uncle, Pius VI. died in prison, and Pius VII. was detained as a prisoner in France, while the States of the Church were completely in Napoleon's hands. But at the Emperor's exile and overthrow, when Pius VII. returned to the holy city, young Mastai had so far recovered from his epileptic fits as to be ordained priest, and Pius VII. assured him that henceforth the cruel disease would not trouble him again. This was in 1819. In 1823 Canon Mastai was sent on a special mission to Chili, where he spent nearly a year, and, on his return, took charge of the grand asylum of San Michele, where he spent two years, and then was appointed Archbishop of Spoleto. In 1832 the Archbishopric of Spoleto was exchanged for the see of Imola, which led to the Cardinalate in 1839 ; but even then, Cardinal Mastai was as little known in Rome as the Archbishop of Spoleto. His life was entirely spent in good works, and in the acquiring of the many virtues which distinguished him, especially that serenity of faith which never left him under the severest

troubles. In 1846 the papal tiara was placed on his head, the "awful weight" of which he well knew, and spoke of with almost prophetic force in his beautiful letter to his three brothers at Sinigaglia, begging their prayers. The first years of the Pontificate of Pius IX. form, as Mr. Hassard remarks, a chapter of thoroughly enchanting romance, and were, in fact, the fragrant blossoming of the fourteen years spent at Spoleto in a holy, hidden life. We cannot linger over the charming anecdotes of this time, when the new Pope went here and there among his people, like Haroun Alraschid, in disguise. To prisons, to hospitals, to monasteries, went the hidden guest, seeing with his own eyes and hearing with his own ears the evils and scandals that abounded, and gently but firmly redressing every grievance that came within his reach. But he was soon called to heavier duties even than these, which subjected him also to more doubtful claims. Having declared an amnesty for all political offenders, when 1,600 persons were set loose to return upon Rome and the States, the secret societies were so triumphant at his generosity, that they loudly declared their intention of stretching it to the utmost limits. Mazzini had even the audacity to write to the Pope, exhorting him to have perfect faith in the revolutionary party, and protesting that they would all make for him a stronger government than was ever yet seen in Europe. In 1847, in the face of the revolutionary movement, the Pope was offered 5,000 troops by France; but he refused them, saying that he would trust to his own people. He then threw open his cabinet to Prince Aldobrandini and three other laymen, and put a layman also at the head of the police; but when urged to further concessions tending to encroach upon his temporal sovereignty, he firmly refused to go one step beyond what he had laid down. He refused to make war upon Austria; but was a warm partisan of what would probably have been a genuine and hearty Italian unity; i.e., a league of the various states, which should hold its diet at Rome. This plan, so consistent with the whole wishes and spirit of the widely-varying Italian populations, was destroyed by the ambition of the King of Sardinia, to whom the crown of Italy was a tempting bait. The conclusion of this most instructive story must be studied by each one for himself; and those who read will wonder afresh at the marvellous way in which the "hour" spoken of by Our Lord of the Prince of evil as the "Prince of this world" repeats itself. The horrible incidents of the revolution of 1849 have probably never yet been fully appreciated by the world; the profanity, the diabolic hatred of all holy things, the cruel torture and butchery of priests as the ministers and friends of God. The last years of Pope Pius IX., gradually drawing him more and more within the veil which hangs between the two worlds,—his unshaken patience,—and the extraordinary calm of his death, are well narrated by Mr. Hassard, whose little book speaks more eloquently to the heart than the copiousness of many volumes.

What Catholics do not believe (a *Lecture reprinted with the Author's permission*). By the Right Rev. P. J. RYAN, Bishop of Tricomia, and Coadjutor to the Archbishop of St. Louis. London: Washbourne. 1878.

AN excellent lecture originally delivered to a Protestant audience, likely in its reprinted form to do much good in the way of removing prejudices, by showing that the objections made by Protestants to the Catholic Church do not apply to what she teaches, but to doctrines falsely attributed to her by men who, living outside her communion and ignorant alike of her doctrine and her spirit, yet pretend to know more of her dogmas than those who not only profess them but make them their guide in life.

The Franciscan Annals and Monthly Bulletin of the Third Order of St. Francis. Vols. I and II. R. Washbourne, 18, Paternoster-row.

EVERY good journal that makes a place for itself in Catholic homes, is doing a most valuable work. It might be well if the powers that are now distributed on many journals of the humbler sort were combined to support and increase the circulation of a few; but that, we dare say, is impossible. The aims and interests concerned are as diverse as those which are involved in the question of higher education, and as difficult, perhaps, of amalgamation. The next best thing, however, is to have the magazines, whether few or many, circulating as widely as possible among Catholics. The "*Franciscan Annals*," as its title implies, has a special aim, and chiefly appeals for support to the members of the Third Order of St. Francis; but we are quite sure that neither the editor nor the good Fathers under whose patronage it appears would selfishly desire to restrain its favours to any limited class of readers. We have no hesitation in recommending it to all Catholic families, in which the better-known journals have, or have not, a place. It is a valuable addition to our Catholic literature of the "*Lamp*," "*Monitor*," and "*Rosary Magazine*" class. A "*Popular Life of Christ*" has been continued from the first number, and has some good points. We do not care for the paraphrase of our Lord's words (it does not improve them); in other respects, in simplicity of language especially, the "*Life*" is worthy of praise. The "*Chronicle of the Franciscan Order in England*" is the work of a graceful and practised writer, of some one, we suspect, whose writing is to be found outside the pages of this little magazine. The "*Chronicle*" gives an account of the Order from the year of its foundation in the lifetime of the Seraphic Saint. Its entrance into Oxford, and the prominent part it took in the revival of letters, are an interesting story. The very names of some of the great Franciscans, in the first century of the history of the Order, are an indication of the interest to be found in the *Chronicle*. Adam de Marisco, the *Doctor Illustratus*, pupil of Grosst  te, and friend of Simon de Montfort, has a history worthy of the pages devoted to it. Haymo of Eversham, a man of manifold talents and of a very chequered life, was

also a great light of the Order in the thirteenth century. He was at first public Professor at Cambridge, afterwards he was summoned to Rome and made Reader of the Holy Palace; the revision of the Breviary was entrusted to him; and, having been Ambassador at Constantinople, he was raised to the highest dignity of his Order. To another name belongs the unequalled glory of being entitled the Master of St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Bonaventura, and of being, as it were, the fountain of the twin streams, which run in the Dominican and Franciscan channels. Alexander of Hales, the *Doctor Irrefragabilis* and the first commentator on the *Sentences*, was called in a strange way from the joys of intellectual conflicts to the higher joys of the quiet Franciscan cloister. And a greater name still is that of Roger Bacon, the wonderful genius of an age that could not comprehend him, because he was too far in advance of it. It may be readily seen that the writer of the "Chronicle of the Franciscan Order in England" has splendid materials to work on.

The contributions to the magazine are very varied. In the poetry we find rhymed legends of Franciscan Saints, marked at least with great simplicity. There are also papers on Father John Forest, the martyr, and on Columbus, Pius IX., Leo XIII., and other Tertiaries of the Franciscan Order. Selections are given every month from the quaint spiritual aphorisms of Br. Giles, and—but we have said enough to show our readers the value of this interesting and carefully-edited magazine.

Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus. Vol. III. By HENRY FOLEY, S.J. London: Burns & Oates. 1878.

THE records of the Society of Jesus continue through another volume containing the missions of Durham, Yorkshire, and Hampshire, and the lives of Thomas Pounce of Belmont, George Gilbert of Suffolk, and Father Thomas Darbyshire. Every page of the records contained in this large volume has an interest of its own, but we may single out, as giving it special value, the portions relating to York—where at one period the old castle became at once a prison-house and a stronghold of the faith; and the account of the mission of Maryland which is given among the papers relating to the college of St. Thomas of Canterbury, the Hampshire district. In 1633 the mission was begun by Father Andrew White, the apostle of Maryland. He had been a fellow-novice with Father Garnett, and before entering the Society he had already suffered imprisonment for the faith as a seminary priest from Douay. After passing through his novitiate at Louvain and spending some time in Spain, he returned to the English mission. Charles I. had sent out a naval expedition, which had conquered the territories bordering upon Virginia, and part of his new possessions he called Maryland, after his Queen Henrietta Maria. When the first governor went out to the new province, he was accompanied by Father Andrew White, three other priests, and a lay-brother. They were soon joined by other missionaries, and they began their labours among the colonists and the Indians, sowing some of the first seeds of American

Catholicity, which in our days we see spreading with such vigorous growth. Father White wrote a dictionary and grammar of the language of the Indians of Maryland, also a Catechism in that tongue, and a history of Maryland, and of his voyage. This narrative is given in the volume before us, forming several pages of surpassing interest. It is followed by the annual letters of the English province regarding the mission of Maryland; so that here we have a complete and graphic contemporary history of the small beginnings of missionary work on what has since proved to be a most fruitful soil.

It would be all but impossible that such a mass of records, lists, and genealogies as this volume contains, could be edited and published without some errors being discoverable on a careful search being made for them by specialists. We are sure that the learned editor will be glad to receive any notification of such as may be discovered by readers possessed of local or antiquarian knowledge on this or that point, for we may safely say that his object is not to win the literary reputation which his great work deserves, but to give the world the materials for a true and exact recital of the great work done by the sons of St. Ignatius in England in days of heresy and persecution. No merely human organization can boast such a record of the past as we find in these pages. The volume is embellished with beautiful portraits of the martyred priests Cortly and Cornelius, as well as other illustrations. It is a book that deserves to find a wide circle of readers, as it has a living interest far beyond that of works addressed only to the student and specialist. The next volume is to contain, amongst other matter, the lives of Fathers Garnett and Oldcome, and promises to be of equal value with that before us.

Life of St. Winefred, Virgin, Martyr, and Abbess. By the Rev. THOMAS MEYRICK, M.A., author of "St. Willibrord," &c. London: R. Washbourne, 18, Paternoster Row. 1878.

THE life of St. Winefred excels the lives of St. Willibrord and St. Bonifacius by the same author, and that is a great deal to say in its praise. We have here the same wide grasp of a beautiful subject; the same flowing style, that shows how a saint's history may be told as a charming story: but there is in the life of the Virgin-martyr of Wales so much poetic beauty, that the author's style fits it admirably, and makes of it a more beautiful and perfect whole than the history of the wider and rougher lives of great apostles. The history of the saint is, like her picture in the frontispiece—a picture formed of a few lines and a little light and shade; bold, but tenderly drawn; not designed on new-fangled principles, but in the grand old spirit, and breathing everywhere faith and devotion. Every one knows the story of Winefred, slain at the chapel door by her rejected suitor, Caradoc, Prince of Powys, and then restored to life by St. Beuno, to live as abbess of a community for many years. But every one does not know all the beautiful things that are in these few pages. As an example of the subject and style, we may give the parting

of the aged Beuno and the young maiden whom he had raised to life at the spot whence gushed forth as a torrent the miraculous water.

Then, seeing her greatly grieved at his departure, he took her by the hand and led her to the well, where, sitting upon a stone by its side, which is now in the outer well and is called St. Beuno's stone, he said, as related chiefly by Robert the Prior, and confirmed in the ancient manuscripts :—

“ You see this monument of your suffering, and the stones stained as if with your blood for the sake of your heavenly Spouse. Hear, then, three special things by which your glorious Spouse and Lord Jesus Christ will honour you and benefit others hereafter by you.”

Then he tells her, first, that those stones shall never be washed from their stains :—

Secondly, that all who pray thrice at that spot shall be delivered from corporal or spiritual distress, or in heaven they shall more amply reap the fruit of their prayers : Thirdly :—

“ After my departure from you, which I am about to take to a distant part of this land, God will give me a cell by the seashore, and when you would send a message or token to me (as His Divine Majesty would have you do, and I entreat of you the same once a year) cast it into this well or the stream which flows from it, and, passing into the ocean, it will be miraculously conveyed safely to me through many winding shores.

“ And these graces shall be told to your renown to the world's end.”

The Story of the Passion. By F. ALEXIUS MILLS. London :
Burns & Oates.

THIS volume gives a short and simple account of the Divine Drama, drawing from it, as it proceeds, practical lessons and useful reflections for the soul.

WE have also received *A Catechism for First Confession*, by the Rev. Mr. Davis (Washbourne), which seems to contain every useful instruction for the Sacrament of Penance ; and *Instructions and Devotions for Confession*, for the use of convent schools (Burns & Oates), a little book admirably suited for its purpose. It is clear, full, and exact, without being lengthy, and contains an examination of conscience for children that must be eminently satisfactory to parents and all who have children in charge. And those who have had to deal with the subject must be well aware that the generality of the examinations published are not fit to place in their hands.

Correspondence.

A PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY INDISPENSABLE TO CATHOLIC EDUCATION.

To the Editor of the DUBLIN REVIEW.

SIR,—In resuming, by your permission the subject of my last letter (see the number for July, 1877), I may be allowed to offer an expression of public gratitude for a sentence with which the number for April of this year concludes :—" *Nothing can come that is good, except our faith be sincere, loyal, thoroughly Roman. But it must animate heart and intellect.*"

I suppose no one will very easily persuade themselves otherwise than that if our faith is to be in any sense at all Roman, it must then be something very proximate to definite ; and if it is to be *thoroughly* Roman, then it must be *thoroughly* definite. A narrow path is, properly speaking, in its own nature a definite path, and while the Gospel says that the way which leads to destruction is broad, it says that the way that leads to life is narrow. If the path that leads to life is narrow, it is undoubtedly a merit in a narrow path that it should be clearly defined ; for then no one is in any danger of losing it through error. Those who are drawn aside from it into any other path, are at least drawn aside with their eyes open and with the knowledge that they are being drawn aside. This, then, is the merit of the path, if it must be narrow, that it should also be definite, and hence, however sincere and loyal faith may be as regards the person, the path in which this sincere and loyal faith must walk is a narrow path, and this same narrow path must be a Roman path, if it is to lead to any good.

Now a "*Roman path*" will sound like a phrase without a definite meaning, perhaps even without so much as any meaning whatsoever, definite or indefinite, unless we have some philosophy on the subject which affords the key to its meaning. Considering the prevalent character of the English mind and the butterfly manner in which it habitually flutters zigzag from philosophy to philosophy, from opinion to opinion, and how, in the concrete, the ordinary Englishman usually derives what little philosophy he may happen to have in his mind from the leakage of all imaginable sorts of infidel and self-contradictory theories and opinions, of the paternity of which he has commonly speaking the smallest possible stock of knowledge ; however vague the conception may be which he will be likely to form as to what may be really meant by the term "*Roman path*," *primâ facie* it is one not at all likely to convey a pleasant idea. The term "*Roman path*" it is probable will be immediately sug-

gestive of two distinctly disagreeable suspicions. It is in the first place likely that a Roman path will be a straight path, and you might as well require the butterfly of the physical creation to exchange its zigzag flight for the straight flight of the kingfisher, as require the ordinary Englishman, with his mind formed upon the leakage of all possible philosophies, to fall into the straight and well-defined path traced out by any one philosophy in particular. In the next place, the Roman path is a path the boundary-lines of which are historical, and as such external, both to the man himself and also to his national history. The path, again, is one that is defined by a number of clear and illustrious examples, all of which must be matter of competent knowledge, so that mere general goodwill is here completely at fault. Nothing evidently will avail here except knowledge, aye, and accurate knowledge too. But our superficial age loves smatterings of everything and cares for accurate knowledge in no one thing; what wonder then, if the very name of Roman is a name of terror, that is, to the ordinary Englishman, and, the more the pity, but I am afraid to say to what extent, the standard of the ordinary Englishman is also the beau ideal of the Catholic Englishman.

Here the extreme pertinence of the following words from the Encyclical of the present reigning Pontiff will be at once perceived: "The more strongly the enemies of religion try to teach the unwary, and especially the young, such things as would darken their minds and corrupt their morals, so much the more vigorously must we strive that not only a good and solid education may prevail, but that, above all, the education itself may be such as may, in all points, both in works of literature (*litteris*) and in the methods of dealing with subjects of instruction (*disciplinis*), be conformable to the Catholic faith. Especially must this be so in philosophy, from which the right direction (*recta ratio*) of all other sciences depends."

From these words of the Sovereign Pontiff it follows that history cannot be adequately taught, where it is taught only as a mere mass of unconnected facts. If, for example, you are to teach ancient history as a whole to any real profit to the Catholic pupil, it must be taught in connection with a philosophy of ancient history, which undertakes to lay before the intelligence of the pupil the general system or plan of the Divine Government under which the various events of human history are seen to be directed to the accomplishment of the Divine Will. In any Christian system of this philosophy of history the central point can be no other than the Incarnation of God. Everything in the world before Christ has been planned in view to prepare for the coming of the Second Divine Person of the Holy Trinity in His human nature, and after His Incarnation everything has been and will be directed to the furthering of the Work of His Church. Should any attempt have been made to frame a system of the Christian philosophy of ancient history, for the benefit both of those who have to teach ancient history and of those who have to learn, the very first condition of such an attempt must be that it should be clear and definite. If it is not clear and definite, it is then contemptible and not worthy of further notice. Should it however prove to be clear and definite, the next

question after this will be, does it contain and teach the truth? Does it or does it not reasonably elucidate the Divine plan for the government of the world in such a manner as to correspond to the following words of the Sovereign Pontiff,—“that philosophy does not tend to the overthrow of Divine revelation, but delights rather to prepare the way for it and to defend it from its assailants, as the great Augustine and the Angelic Doctor, with the other masters of Christian wisdom, have taught us by their example.” If it should possess, according to the measure of imperfect human things, a fair correspondence with these requirements of the Sovereign Pontiff, what are we then to expect? We are then certainly to expect that it will be repudiated by the “ordinary Englishman,” and this for the reason that he will resent it as an aggression upon his liberty of continuing to feed his mind with the leakage of all the existing contradictory infidel philosophies, and because it fixes him to something definite. But as regards the Catholic Englishman, what of him? The Catholic Englishman, like every son of Adam, is left to his choice. “Mundum tradidit in disputationem eorum,” is the Scripture account of the liberty which is the gift of God. If we are to speculate what the choice of the Catholic Englishman is likely to be, it would be necessary to try and gain a clue to the solution of a previous question, viz., how far “in concreto” the stamp of the ordinary Englishman would be to him his peculiar “beau ideal” of humanity. In whatever degree there might be reason to think that such was the case, it is, I am afraid, but reasonable to presume that the Catholic Englishman would follow his model, and that in this case, as far as he is concerned, there would be an end to the philosophy in question. However, there is nothing to prevent the Catholic Englishman putting to himself the question, “May not this philosophy of ancient history possibly contain substantial truth, and does not God Almighty place me under direct obligation to truth?” Where the question of truth and the obligation to truth is fairly brought under consideration, the force of the example of the “ordinary Englishman,” it is to be presumed, would be very greatly diminished.

Precisely the same rule holds good in dealing with Roman history. According to the words of the Sovereign Pontiff above quoted, there must be a philosophy of Roman history which is its “*recta ratio*,” and apart from which the pupil must necessarily be deprived of at least the main and most important benefit of his study. I shall readily grant that the study of Roman history brings not a few benefits to the student, and these anything but unimportant benefits, apart from any attempt to associate Roman history with the philosophy that is its particular “*recta ratio*.” Let the mind of the student be simply left to itself to think whatever it can, or chooses, as to the appearance of such a meteor in the history of mankind as the growth of the power of the City of Rome, with the final disappearance of its military sovereignty and the coming in its place of the Christian pastoral sovereignty of the chair of the Apostle Peter; I should still readily concede that the mere details of Roman history cannot but be replete with numerous benefits. I should not hesitate to admit, for instance, that the political greatness of

the English nation in the world is in an eminent degree the reward of the very genuine familiarity that all the educated classes of the nation acquire with the great examples of the virtues of public and private life exemplified in the distinguished citizens of Rome, through our excellent practice of studying Roman history.

Great, however, as these results are in their own way, I do not see how any one who accepts the Sovereign Pontiff's words,—“that the instruction itself (*institutio*) must be made conformable with the Catholic faith, both in the works of literature it uses and in the methods of dealing with its subjects of instruction (*litteris et disciplinis*), can justifiably rest satisfied with confining the benefits of the study of Roman history to the class of benefits above described. In this case there would be an entire absence of all endeavour to secure a direct conformity with the Catholic faith. That English youth learning Roman history at the present moment, in the way above described, actually derive a great degree of benefit from it, I have admitted, but this degree of benefit, it should be observed, falls short in two important particulars of precisely the same kind of benefit which Roman youth, in the days of Julius Cæsar, learning the same history, would derive from their study. Roman youth and their instructors had a very definite perception that the greatness of their city and its empire was due to Divine favour and protection, and on the continuance of this favour they relied for the preservation of the glory and dignity of their city. Hence, Roman youth would necessarily be far more inflamed with the combined ardour of religion and patriotism to imbibed the spirit of their noble ancestors from their study of Roman history than English youth possibly can be. And to this it is to be added, that the more the minds of the youth of England are drawn into the system of being fed with the indiscriminate leakage of the various infidel philosophies that inundate current literature in every shape and form, the less and less will become the charm of these Roman examples.

The youth of England, for example, have pretty well by this time imbibed, through the process of leakage above described, the German notion of an early Roman legend. And as this notion places them, (as it does everybody else who is weak enough to be led by it,) under the simple impossibility of knowing, with any certainty, where the frontier-line is to be placed, on one side of which the history is a legend, and on the other credible narrative, a certain mist of unreality will more and more come to be thrown over all the great Roman examples, and their power as examples will be in consequence proportionately destroyed. There was no German legend, it must be remembered, in the time of the Roman youth, to diminish the power of the great Roman examples over their minds.

The next consequence of the German notion of an early Roman legend is worse still. The necessary logical sequel that comes from the German early Roman legend, is the “German Mythical Christ.” The self-same mental process by which the hard realities of early Roman times are taken away from the domain of a history vouched for by its

monuments and written documents, confirmed by the belief of all the nations for two thousand years, in order to be transformed by a handful of Germans into mere mythical unreality, will hold equally good for transforming the Christ, who suffered under Pontius Pilate, in whom all nations believe, into a similar German mythical unreality.

Our Catholic instructors of youth can consequently have very slender grounds indeed for being satisfied with themselves, that they are in any sense adequately discharging their duty to their pupils, if they undertake to teach them Roman history apart from the particular philosophy of the history which is its "*recta ratio*," bringing it into perfect conformity with the Catholic faith. Apart from this philosophy, Roman history as a study may be credited with a certain power to benefit the student, as I admit, but the benefit, I contend, will only be the same in kind, and very inferior in degree to the benefit which the same history conferred upon the Roman youth of the time of Julius and Augustus Cæsar. The history was better known then, and those who studied it then had unquestionably a ground peculiarly their own for a far deeper interest in it. The one thing which is capable of giving superiority to the Christian teaching of Roman history, and with which superiority it is in our power to endow our Catholic schools, is the Christian philosophy of Roman history, which is its "*recta ratio*." Cast this Christian philosophy away, and, *velis nolis*, your Roman history descends as a study to a notably lower level than it held for Roman youth in the days of Julius Cæsar. This is one of the stubborn things called facts, and do what you will the fact will be the fact.

Where is then, it will be asked, this Christian Philosophy of Roman history, which is to be its *recta ratio*, lifting its study to a level of superiority in our Catholic schools over that which it held in the schools of Imperial Rome? I admit that we have to a great extent to gather it together, and to bring it forward for use; but this is precisely what the reigning Pontiff cries out *must* be done. "*The more the enemies of religion do their evil work, the more vigorously must we strive to do our work against them.*" Here is the true spirit of Ancient Rome speaking through the See of Peter.

"*Tu ne cede malis sed contra audentior ito.*"

The first condition of a Christian Philosophy of Roman history, as I need not contend, for the truth speaks for itself, must be the trampling under foot the detestable and execrable German deception of the "early Roman legend." A mythical Roman legend cannot carry a philosophy which is its *recta ratio*. There can be no such thing as a *recta ratio* of a myth. God cannot be glorified in any other way than in the way which He has Himself prescribed by the words of His Archangel: "*Vos autem benedicite Deum et enarrate omnia mirabilia ejus.*" "But do you bless God and relate all His wonderful works" (Job xii. 20). If we Catholics can be such blind fools as to listen to a mere upstart handful of Germans, who having already transformed Christ Himself into a mythical fiction, proceed to transform the early history of Rome, which all

nations for two thousand years have received as substantially historical, into a second mythical fiction, we must pay the penalty of our criminal folly, by finding that it shuts the door on the possibility of our ever having the philosophy of Roman history, which is its one sole *recta ratio*, and which, as being such, is the one sole way of making the teaching of Roman history in our Catholic schools superior to what it was in the schools of Imperial Rome.*

The second condition of our coming to acquire this Christian philosophy of Roman history must be sought in the combination of labour and study that will be required to produce it. I suppose I am not going out of the way in saying that I am myself responsible for more than one contribution to this common stock.

I contend that this particular Philosophy, which is to be the *recta ratio* of Roman history, is a crying necessity of our times; and in proof of my being sincere in holding that what we need in this respect has to be finally elaborated from a combination of international thought and study, and that not only should no one person, but no one nation, should think itself competent straightway to impose its own particular construction of this *recta ratio* on others, I beg you to accept and give currency to a translation of a review of the two works which are my principal contribution to the common cause.† It appears in the "Stimmen aus Maria Laach," a periodical devoted to Catholic literature, and honourably meriting its title of a Catholic review by its readiness to take account of all that concerns the Catholic cause which appears in other languages

* Mr. Th. H. Dyer, author of "A History of the City of Rome" (Longmans), in his introduction to his volume, observes,—“If a writer turns to an historian of the modern school, he finds these Etruscan kings and their deeds are nothing better than unsubstantial creations of the brain. The general picture before us, says Dr. Arnold in reference to these kings, is a mere fantasy.” Under such circumstances, Mr. Dyer observes, there is nothing left for an historian of the city but to choose between two courses, either to tell his readers that the "Tullianum, the Cloaca, &c., are undoubtedly very ancient works, and anterior to the Republic, but that no idea can be formed as to whom they should be ascribed, or, to follow the narrative handed down by ancient authors." "After some deliberation," says Mr. Dyer, "we have adopted the latter course," and he proceeds to give his reasons.

He shows that the doubts of the German school are unreasonably sceptical, that the Roman historians had at their command an ample sufficiency of different classes of credible documents to attest the substantial reality of their history. In fact, the remains of some of the monuments of the Regal and Republican periods he considers to be the best proofs of the fundamental truth of early Roman history. The German myth-makers, as may be easily understood, find it easier to dissolve the person of Tarquinius Priscus into a piece of phantasy than his "Cloaca Maxima," a substantial "*pièce de résistance*," which every traveller to Rome can go and inspect for himself.

† The two works in question are, (I.) "Monotheism the Primitive Religion of Rome" (Williams & Norgate, London); (II.) "A Compendium of the Philosophy of Ancient History" (Burns & Oates).

besides its own. The literal translation of this review is what I here propose for careful perusal.

Trusting that a critique which expresses the mind of another nation and people will not be unacceptable to the readers of the DUBLIN REVIEW, and that the common cause will become the gainer by a great increase of the study and attention henceforward to be given to this question of the philosophy, as well of the history in general as of the Roman history in particular which are necessarily taught in our schools,

I remain, with much respect,

Your obedient servant,

HENRY FORMBY.

Hinckley, June 25th, 1878.

[In placing Mr. Formby's letter before our readers we endorse all that he so ably says of the necessity of viewing the history of ancient Rome in connection with her high mission as the destined centre of Christianity. In doing this, however, we cannot pledge ourselves to all the details of the argument, and we especially must take exception to the statement that the logical sequence of the theory of a mythical early history of Rome is the theory of a mythical Christ. "The selfsame mental process," says Mr. Formby, "by which the hard realities of early Roman times are taken away from the domain of a history vouched for by its monuments and written documents, and confirmed by the belief of all the nations for two thousand years, in order to be transformed by a handful of Germans into mere mythical unreality, will hold equally good for transforming the Christ who suffered and died under Pontius Pilate, in whom all nations believe, into a similar German mythical unreality." We think that in reviewing this statement Mr. Formby will agree with us that he has very much overstated his case. The argument against the accuracy of Livy's opening books is a very different thing from the attack upon the four Gospels, and we are happy to think that a man may be a follower of Niebuhr without being logically inconsistent in refusing to follow David Friedrich Strauss. The question of the credibility of early Roman history must be fairly argued on its own merits; and we must submit to Mr. Formby, that in order to give real weight to his theory, that Numa was a link between the Mosaic revelation and Roman monotheism, he must first establish the fact that Numa is an historical reality who left a real legislation, and in so doing he must disentangle from an undoubted legend its probable nucleus of historical truth. This is no easy task; but, as he has made Numa the keystone of his system, it is unavoidable.

We here append the translation of the German review of Mr. Formby's two works, to which that gentleman refers in his letter.]

A Compendium of the Philosophy of Ancient History ("Abriss einer Philosophie der alten Geschichte"). By the Rev. HENRY FORMBY. London: Burns & Oates.

THE leading thought (*Grundgedanke*) of this little work, which has just made its appearance, is put before the reader in a form clear and precise in the introduction. The educated world of the present day has the choice placed before it, Shall we, or shall we not, accept the Christian Revelation? Shall we, or shall we not, believe in Christ and in His redemption of the world? Admitted that we are to believe, and there is at once placed before us, in the fact of this redemption, an intervention on the part of God in the affairs of men, of a nature to fill the human mind with the utmost wonder. It is self-evident that God must have prepared the way beforehand for an act of this kind with great wisdom, as indeed many remarkable events of history are there to show in addition to the widespread expectations of the nations for the coming of their Redeemer. Hence arises the important consequence: classical studies, the universally-adopted means of education for the higher classes, are a two-edged sword, from the kind of use of which it mainly depends whether they greatly contribute to strengthen, or whether they tend seriously to undermine faith; and it consequently rests with the master in these studies to take care that his scholar, while he is being initiated into the knowledge of the heathen world, should also be made acquainted with the ways of God, by which the world before Christ was brought to its Redeemer. The author's Compendium of the Philosophy of History, which is limited to the times before Christ, is designed to act the part of a sign-post, and to point out the way. That a vital question is here broached cannot be doubted. Equally clear is it, that the right way is that which leads at once "in medias res," and proceeds to seek an answer from the fact of the existence in the world of the supernatural order. Let us see how the attempt succeeds.

The first principle of a Philosophy of History is the acknowledgment of a divine plan in history, which the Providence of God carries into execution by means of its own. The author devotes his two first chapters to the exposition of this truth. The study of history strengthens the human mind, both in the belief and in submission to a Providence ruling supremely over all events. In no one point is this more evident than in the history of Rome. Who can fail to perceive the handiwork of God in the placing of this cosmopolitan city at the head of the nations? Rome first combines and gathers together in the Gentile world the divine means for preparing the way for Christ in the same manner as afterwards, when, by its own shortcomings, it had forfeited its sovereignty over the nations, Rome derives from Christ all its subsequent importance in the Christian world. According to Mr. Formby's view, Rome in its sovereignty over the family of the nations while they were still in heathenism, and much more in its subsequent supremacy over the Christian family of nations, has given proof of its most intimate connection with the divine plan of con-

ducting humanity to its supreme end, through the incarnation of the Son of God. This affords the ground for pursuing later on the further development of the part specially assigned to Rome in the carrying out of the Divine plan.

There now follows an enumeration of the means employed in the working out the Divine plan of preparation for the coming of the Son of God upon earth, which forms the subject of the nine following chapters. The central points round which all the other measures are grouped appear to the author to be—

1. The Deluge.
2. The Confusion of Tongues.
3. The Call of the Chosen Nation.

4. The Creation of an Imperial Sovereignty, the gerents of which were first the Assyrians, and in succession the Babylonians, the Persians, the Greeks, and the Romans.

The remainder of the volume, chapters 12–20, are occupied with considering the most perfect of the gerents of this Sovereignty, ROME, in order to collect together, as it were, the different rays of light of the Divine government of the human race to their focus. Through His Virgin Mother, descended from the royal race of David, the Redeemer belongs to the chosen nation. But inasmuch as he was born into the world just in time to fall in with the census of the Roman citizens, commanded to be taken by Augustus, he was inscribed on this census-roll as a Roman citizen. Inasmuch as Rome combined the civilization of the Greeks, another gift of Divine Providence, with the inheritance of the Imperial Sovereignty of the Assyrians, in order to lead the way to Christ, all the ways of this preparation find their terminus in Rome.

The “ultima ratio” of these measures of preparation is very much withdrawn from any minute human scrutiny, owing to its belonging to the secret counsels of God. With a suitable proviso on this head the author seeks to discover the “rationale” of the above-mentioned four acts of Divine intervention in the world. The Deluge appears to him as a great example “in terrorem,” to inculcate upon the human mind by the destruction of the unbelievers the necessity of submission to the Sovereignty of God. The second Patriarch of our race, the Priest and Prophet Noe, perpetuated this truth in a form of law and doctrine, thereby becoming the founder of a Patriarchal Catholicism: One law, one religion, and one language—the golden age of the human family (p. 22). The conspiracy of the builders of the Tower of Babel, the first instance of state absolutism set up against the Catholic unity of our race, called forth the counter measure on the part of God of the confusion of languages, with its penal consequence, national separatism, and its fruit, polytheism. St. Augustine also saw in Nimrod (Civ. Dei, xvi. 4), the first founder of a reign of terror, which contemplated reducing the whole human family to its yoke. The difference between Nimrod’s ambitious design and that of similar attempts which it has pleased God to permit in after-times, consists, according to the author, in this, that by reason of the then existing unity of race and religion, Nimrod would have been straightway able to

degrade religion into an instrument of oppression. State absolutism in religion, however, is so terrible an evil, that God decided to remove it by means of a lesser evil. Still national separatism continues to subsist as one of the deep wounds of our race, for a standing warning to all future builders of Towers of Babel, and partisans of a "kulturkampf."

A positive remedial measure is found in the choice and mission of the Israelite people from out of which the Benediction for all the nations of the earth was to come forth. The Hebrew nation, as the gerent of the true religion, must become visible to all the nations of the earth, only, in order to render this possible, the human family needed the application of another remedy, the mission of an Imperial Sovereignty over a wide extent of different peoples, who would be thereby not only preserved from barbarism and maintained in civilization, but would be brought into contact with the chosen Hebrew people. On this account the people who were the gerents of this Sovereignty were brought by a disposition of Divine Providence into contact with the Hebrew people, and made by this means into instruments for the diffusion of the true monotheistic religion.

We are now come to a point where the ideas of the author begin to assume the form of a theory which is peculiar to himself, at the head of which is the view that the former Rome, prefigured in the Type of Esau, was formed by anticipation through a special dispensation of Divine Providence for its subsequent calling as the Head of the Christian World. Cursorily the author has given the following expression to his line of thought in the introduction to his volume on "Monotheism":—

"I have long been engaged upon a work specially directed to meet and remove a difficulty of our modern sceptics. The work in question, if I live to complete it, is intended to bear the title, 'The Testimony of History, Ancient and Modern, to the Divinity of Jesus Christ,' and the result it will aim at establishing will be to show by means of appropriate proofs derived from the general body of the History, that the nations of the world, from the days of Noe downward, have been under the visible guidance of a Divine Government, which has ordered with the most perfect wisdom every event, so as to display the greatest care for the nations, which they were willing to accept, as well as to prepare everything with the most unimpeachable forethought for His own coming into the world in His human nature" (page xxviii).

Here our author takes pains to impress on his readers the noteworthy fact, that the different gerents of the Imperial Sovereignty over a great variety of people were all brought into very close contact with the Hebrew people. Twice was a Hebrew prophet sent to Ninive, and one of these missions, that of Jonas, was so productive of good, that the ruin threatened upon the city was removed by the repentance of the king and the whole people. Kindred facts are referred to in the two captivities of the Israelite people, their friendly relations with the Persian court, as likewise with Alexander; especially, also, the call of Cyrus (Isaias xlv. 1-7) to bring back the chosen people to the promised land. The author infers from this, the existence of a direct special Providence watching over these Sovereignties analogous to that which watched over the chosen people. He appears to have formed an idea of these political Sovereignties, that they were called

to act in a higher order than merely in the benefits belonging to the natural order. The good fruits of the Imperial Sovereignty appear such as almost exclusively belong to the natural order. Peace, public security, union of nations, prosperity of commerce, promotion of sciences and arts, and the general facilitation of intercourse. But because, in addition to this, they have a further mission, by virtue of which they are concerned with the goods of a higher order, a providential care over them analogous to that over the chosen people is to be claimed for them.

The reviewer now proceeds in the space of two pages to express his dissent from the possibility of such a claim being allowed, chiefly alleging that an undue importance appears to be thereby claimed for the mission of Jonas, which he seems to regard as nothing more than the sending a missionary from a foreign land to a few poor Ninivites, that need not have any particular meaning ; quoting also from Cornelius a Lapide, in his commentary on the mission of the four greater prophets, who writes in complete unconsciousness of the claim and of the reasons why the claim should be made.

The issue here raised by the reviewer is, it is true, a side issue, but still it is one that has its own importance, and it claims its share of careful study in the general subject. This he now resumes as follows :—

A further peculiarity of the author is his view that Numa Pompilius had imposed by law upon the Romans a monotheistic religion, from which, towards the end of the reign of their kings, they had begun to fall away. From this time forward the case of the Romans appears to have not a little similarity with that of the Protestants of the 16th and 17th centuries, who used every endeavour to withdraw from observation their separation from the Catholic Church, in order that it might be forgotten. The state of the case is to be explained thus :—The later writers of the Augustan age have described the polytheistic perversions of the later times as equally belonging to the earlier and better times of Rome, attributing the then existing polytheism to their first lawgiver ; so much knowledge, however, respecting Numa had been preserved, that the truth, as far as he was concerned, could not be altogether suppressed. Thus Livy acknowledges in Numa a knowledge of the existence of a Divine Providence (*interesse humanis rebus cœleste numen*) and a great knowledge of both human and divine law (*omnis humani ac divini juris consultissimus*). Numa, according to the testimony of Varro, preserved by St. Augustine, enacted that the Godhead was to be worshipped without any painted or sculptured image, and when, according to testimony which cannot be rejected, the law-books of Numa were discovered later on, they were burned by order of the Senate, who found it necessary to suppress the knowledge of the contradiction which would have been noticed between them and the existing religious system. In short, not only are there many elements of the original Revelation of Noe found in the old constitution and ways of life of Rome, but many striking positive coincidences also with the legislation of Moses, to bear testimony to the original monotheism of Rome, which some of the fathers, and specially St. Clement of Alexandria, recognize in Numa. Mr. Formby supposes a direct communication to have

existed between Numa and the Jews who were then reigned over by King Ezechias. With this agree the notices found in Livy and Plutarch, that Numa was a great traveller before he was called from Cures to Rome, especially the mysterious mention by Plutarch of a "Barbarian Philosopher greater than Pythagoras," under whom Moses appears to be pointed at, as the master of Numa. A proof *a priori* in favour of Mr. Formby is found in the view above explained concerning the mission of the Imperial powers. Rome has in this respect a much more direct mission for preparing the way for the coming of the Redeemer than any of its predecessors; it may therefore properly be presupposed that its communication with the chosen nation would be much more complete. We here select only a few of the features of the history of ancient Rome; and could what Mr. Formby intends to prove by them be established, a very decided providential guidance of the Roman people could not then be denied. The Romans would then be that people which, on the general wreck of the inheritance descended from Noah, had preserved by far the largest share of it. Her position in the Church would then be the carrying to completion that which God had planned in the very beginning of its history. The limits of the natural order would not in this case necessarily have been overstepped. Mr. Formby, however, appears to us to go too far in his main point, inasmuch as Rome, in the fulness of time, under the Asmonean princes (i.e. B.C. 63), when Pompey took the Temple by storm, entered into intimate and durable relations with the Jewish nation; Mr. Formby's requirement appears to be sufficiently satisfied.

The testimony of the Fathers to the monotheism of Numa, as may be seen from the passages which they quote, is under the influence of passages in the writings of Jews of Alexandria; pointing to monotheistic elements in the classics about the unauthenticity of which there can scarcely be a doubt (*sic*). That the Romans themselves assign to Numa the cultus of a plurality of divinities can scarcely be doubted. Side by side with Janus, the cultus of Vesta is attributed to Numa. We will not lay much stress on this, because it is very difficult to know what really belongs to Numa. Ernst von Lasaulx has examined minutely into both subjects. The principal fact of history, from which some definite conclusion ought to come, is the alleged finding of the religious writings of Numa, put, together with the coincidences in his *Indigitamenta* that are still extant, with the enactments of the Laws of Moses. Mr. Formby, who came to Germany, and especially to its metropolis of the North, to quench his thirst for knowledge previous to his becoming a convert, was not acquainted with the writings of this distinguished student of heathen antiquity when he wrote his two first works, and it is to be presumed, had he been so acquainted, that he would have been confirmed in many of his conclusions; this, however, is not the place to show more at length. Some time afterwards, when Mr. Formby was called upon to reply to a criticism in the *Tablet*, he appealed to Lasaulx, as on his side; and he has now made his circle of English readers acquainted with a treatise of Lasaulx, upon the value of classical studies as an element in the education of youth. Lasaulx unquestionably goes a certain way with Mr.

Formby. He admits certain monotheistic elements in Numa, at the same time that he asserts his real historical character, with the most convincing reasons against the "flippant, critical arrogance," which would equally resolve Charlemagne or Napoleon into myths, on precisely the same grounds as they are pleased to resolve Numa and Moses. Taking his stand on the above-mentioned fact, that happened in the year of the city 578, and which is related at the greatest length by Livy, according to whose narrative the religious books of Numa were found in one of two coffins, but on account of their too dangerous discrepancy from the existing state religion, were burned at the command of the Senate, he is inclined to suppose a sort of "disciplina arcani" in Numa Pompilius, which the lawgiver thought well to carry with him to his tomb, after he had communicated it only to his confidential *entourage*. The obvious coincidences with the Laws of Moses of so much that formed part of the Roman ceremonial observances, to wit, that the Divinity was worshipped without any material representation (up to the time of Servius Tullus?) to which are to be added the burdensome discipline of Numa's ceremonial enactments, and the most punctilious adherence to the formalities of the law, Lasaulx is more disposed to think were rather derived from a source common to the Egyptians equally with Moses, namely the Noachic tradition, than from communication with the Israelites. Haneberg is inclined to suppose they are traceable to a sprinkling of Israelite refugees towards the West from the Assyrian Captivity. What Mr. Formby supposes, in order to account for the phenomena, is not capable of any direct historical proof. Admitting that Numa, on his being called to the throne of Rome, placed Janus at the head of all the divinities of Rome,* a certain leaning towards monotheism is here not to be denied, which again is also not to be overlooked in the cultus of the Latin Jupiter. This, however, does not prove more than that, as was the case with the Persians, as also among the neighbouring people of the Etruscans, the older and purer traditions of God were better preserved by Numa than by the other people of Italy, many settlers from among whom had then found a domicile in Rome. In this, as also in the great energy of the Roman character, which qualified

* The reviewer here refers his readers to Bekker's "Roman Antiquities," vol. iv. p. 25, as giving a full account of the ancient precedence of Janus in Rome, whose priests held a rank equal with royalty up to a late time in the Republic. I may here take the opportunity to notify publicly, that I hope in due time to be prepared with the necessary evidence to prove that JANUS is the Latinized form of the Hebrew name of God, the equivalent of which in Roman letters, a Hebrew scholar (which I much regret not to be) informs me is JAH. Bekker's valuable work on "Roman Antiquities," is now being reissued in Germany in an entirely new and revised form, by its editors, Mommsen and Marquardt. The fifth volume, which is to treat of the "Religious Antiquities" is announced as far advanced in preparation. I wait its appearance, and also a little better leisure from other engagements, in order to arrange and publish the body of evidence. The promise to the Christians is, "That there is nothing hidden that shall not be brought to light," and in the end the secret of Janus will transpire. [Note of the Translator.]

them for universal dominion; we may see the favourable natural disposition towards that which Divine Providence intended to make out of the Romans. But to infer anything which may be described as a parallel with the chosen people, appears to us not capable of being maintained.

We have thought to render the readers of the "Laacher Stimmen" a service in making them acquainted with these interesting publications of the most recent English literature. The wider the stream of historical information extends itself, the more knowledge disposes the human mind to grasp its own past, to appropriate to itself its place upon the earth, and to survey all the members of the great family in a more comprehensive manner; the more opportune will be the invitation, that we should collect our thoughts and ourselves at the feet of our Redeemer, Who, in the midst of the world's career, has shown Himself amongst us to cement together this humanity by the strongest ties and in the most lasting manner.

H. RIESS, S.J.

(From the German of the No. of the "Stimmen aus Maria Laach" for May 28th.)
